

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. VII

Winter Number, 1938

No. 1

EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE	SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT	JAMES R. JOY
WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN	CHARLES K. GILBERT	JOHN W. LANGDALE
LUCIUS H. BUGBEE	LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
FREDERICK K. STAMM		HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Harvie Branscomb	Carl Sumner Knopf	Halford E. Luccock
Edgar Sheffield Brightman	Edward H. Kraus	Harris Franklin Rall
Clarence Tucker Craig	Umphrey Lee	Richard Roberts
Albert Edward Day	Edwin Lewis	Wilbour E. Saunders
Wilbert F. Howard	McIllyar H. Lichliter	Luther A. Weigle

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Oxford and Edinburgh in Retrospect.....	William Adams Brown 3
The Voice of the Church at Oxford.....	Ernest Fremont Tittle 14
After Edinburgh.....	Harris Franklin Rall 22
As Seen By a Layman.....	John Foster Dulles 36
The Ecumenical Movement and the Younger Churches.....	William Paton 45
Let the Church Be the Church.....	Henry Sloane Coffin 54
The Function of the Church-Related College in Our System of Education.....	Charles A. Ellwood 62
Christian Apologetics Today.....	Theodore O. Wedel 72
Realistic Imperialism.....	D. Elton Trueblood 81
Art as the Vehicle for Religious Worship.....	Theodore M. Greene 93
The Cure of Souls.....	John Sutherland Bonnell 106
Whither Chemists?.....	Webster N. Jones 118
An Interpretation of Karl Heim.....	Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr. 128
Recent European Theology.....	K. Birch Hoyle 140
Book Reviews.....	145
Bookish Brevities.....	159

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to John W. Langdale, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Business communications regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1932, at the post-office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. This number is the January, 1938, issue.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; postage free U. S. Possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents; single copies, 75 cents.

For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by The Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Published by
THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

59644

Borden P. Bowne Memorial Fund

Bound Dec. 1938

Who's Who?

JOHN SUTHERLAND BONNELL, D.D. Minister of The Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City.

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, Ph.D., D.D., S.T.D. Joint President of the Conference on Church, Community and State held at Oxford in 1937.

HENRY SLOANE COFFIN, D.D., LL.D. President of Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES, International Lawyer. Secretary at Hague Peace Conference, 1907; Counsel to American Commission at Paris Peace Conference, 1919. New York City.

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD, Ph.D. Professor of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, N. C.

THEODORE M. GREENE, Ph.D. Department of Philosophy, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

R. BIRCH HOYLE, A.T.S. Theological Reviewer for the *British Weekly*, Free Church Chaplain for the Borough of Lambeth, London.

WEBSTER N. JONES, Ph.D. Director, College of Engineering, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Penna.

HUGH THOMSON KERR, JR., Ph.D. Acting Professor of Doctrinal Theology, Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

WILLIAM PATON, D.D. Secretary of The International Missionary Council, London, England.

HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL, D.D., Ph.D. Professor of Christian Doctrine, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.

ERNEST FREMONT TITTLE, D.D. Minister of First Methodist Episcopal Church, Evanston, Illinois.

D. ELTON TRUEBLOOD, D.D. Minister of The Memorial Church, Stanford University, California.

THEODORE O. WEDEL, Ph.D. Department of College Work, The National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND MARCH 3, 1933 of RELIGION IN LIFE, published quarterly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1937.

State of New York
County of New York } ss.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Arthur F. Stevens, who, having been duly sworn according to law, depose and says that he is the business manager of the quarterly, *RELIGION IN LIFE*, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, and amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business manager are:

	Name of—	Post Office Address
Publisher.....	The Abingdon Press, Inc.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Editor.....	John W. Langdale and others.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Managing Editor.....	None.	
Business Manager.....	Arthur F. Stevens.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owner is:

Owned by The Methodist Book Concern.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Publishing Agents:	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

O. Grant Markham.....	150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
George C. Douglass.....	420 Plum Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Fred D. Stone.....	740 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgages, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 17th day of September, 1937. ARTHUR F. STEVENS, Business Manager

[Seal] EDNA G. JEROME, Notary Public, New York County. (My commission expires March 30, 1938.)

Copyright, 1937, by The Abingdon Press, Inc. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

BR
F322
v.7

22

Oxford and Edinburgh in Retrospect

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

OTHER articles in this issue of *RELIGION IN LIFE* will give some account of the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences and attempt an estimate of what each has contributed to the movement for Christian unity. I have been asked to consider the contribution of the two conferences to the ecumenical movement as a whole.

At the outset it must be recognized that the two conferences were very different, not only in the subjects they considered, but in their spirit and mode of approach. The Oxford Conference had for its main purpose to clarify its members' views as to the function of the Church in society and particularly to discover how far it is possible to present a united front in the face of the challenge of an aggressive secularism and the claims of the totalitarian State. It was natural, therefore, that it should welcome all the help it could get from persons who have not hitherto been associated with the movement for Christian unity and that it should regard it as part of its function to speak to the wider public. This wider public was well represented by the four hundred associates and young people, both men and women. The Conference made special provision for interesting these visitors and making them feel that they were a part of the Conference; and it may be said with confidence that no gathering of the kind thus far held has succeeded in arousing such general interest.

The Edinburgh Conference, on the other hand, remained for the most part within the limits set by theological and ecclesiastical precedent. Its discussions, carried on with meticulous care, were to a much greater extent than those of Oxford, academic in character. It is true that the first meeting was given to a survey of the world situation as Oxford had revealed it; but the vista thus opened was not followed up and there was little in the open meetings to appeal to the lay public. Provision was made, to be sure, for a series of brief addresses to visitors on the two opening days, but these were not continued, and by the time the Conference ended the galleries were practically empty.

This was due in part only to the difference in the subject matter. It was due still more to a difference in spirit. To those who planned the Oxford

program the practical issues the Church was facing were in the foreground, and the Church was thought of primarily as the society of men and women through whom the redemptive life of the risen and incarnate Christ was to be mediated to a world in need. To those who shaped that of Edinburgh, the central interest was that of the order and government of the Church rather than its function. In Edinburgh, therefore, doctrinal and ecclesiastical issues held the center of the stage. Justification and sanctification, predestination and free will, the Bible and tradition, the ministry and the sacraments; these were the subjects to which the Conference devoted its chief attention.

It is all the more remarkable that in spite of these differences of method and of procedure there should have been so many points of contact between the two conferences and so much to report which marks distinct progress over their predecessors of a decade ago. At four points at least, such progress was evident. In the first place, in the greater sense of assurance and confidence which characterized the proceedings; secondly, in the more accurate definition of the issues at stake, both in the field of theory and of practice; thirdly, in the clearer perception of the lines along which the movement for unity must proceed; but above all, in the fact that at least at two points definite steps forward were taken which may serve as landmarks to test future progress.

To those who, like the present writer, were members of the Conferences of Stockholm and of Lausanne in 1925 and 1927, nothing was more striking, both at Oxford and at Edinburgh, than the sense of participating in a movement that had passed the experimental stage. The feeling of uncertainty and question which was a noticeable feature of the earlier conferences had almost wholly disappeared. Many of those who took a leading part in the present conferences had been fellow workers for years, and this fact gave assurance to their proceedings. They recognized that they were dealing with fellow Christians whose aims, in spite of all difference in experience and conviction, were in essentials the same as their own. And this explains the naturalness and reality which characterized all that they did. They were not there to create a unity which was nonexistent; but rather to recognize with gratitude the fact that they were already one and to draw from it the necessary consequences.

This sense of belonging to a common movement was noticeable even in the case of those whose theological views differed most widely. At one time in the course of the Edinburgh Conference the representatives of the

Orthodox churches felt constrained to make a declaration setting forth their points of difference from their fellow Christians of other communions; but the fact that they did this, they were careful to point out, did not mean that they proposed to withdraw from the movement. On the contrary it was an added ground for continuing to work and pray together in the hope that unity might eventually be achieved.

At no point was the contrast between the earlier and later conferences more apparent than in the attitude taken by the Church of Rome. At Lausanne, so far at least as official action was concerned, the Roman authorities studiously ignored what was being done. At Edinburgh, not only were unofficial visitors present by invitation (there were at least four such visitors who were freely admitted to the sectional meetings), but the Conference received a courteous letter of welcome from the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Aberdeen, expressing regret that the pressure of conference business made it impossible for him to entertain its members as he would otherwise gladly have done. Still more noticeable was a communication received from the Prior of the Benedictine Priory at Amay sur-Meuse, Belgium, from which I quote the following sentence:

"If we are absent from Edinburgh, we are with you in heart and we desire most ardently that the Conference may succeed in establishing a lasting dogmatic basis for the reunion of Christendom. Above all, be assured yourself and be so good as to assure your collaborators that, at this time, we make, in conformity with Saint Paul's instructions, 'supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings for all men . . . to come to the knowledge of the truth' . . . 'according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in him, in the dispensation of the fullness of times to re-establish all things in Christ'" (Ephesians 1. 9, 10).

As an indication of the interest with which the Roman Catholics have followed the proceedings at Edinburgh I may mention the fact that *The Tablet*, the organ of the Roman Catholics in England, gave three long articles to an account of the Conference. In one of these the writer, Father Bévénat, of the Society of Jesus, felt it necessary to explain in some detail the reason for the failure of his church to participate. This failure was not due, he insisted, to any lack of sympathy with the purpose of the Conference, but to the fear lest participation in it would seem to compromise the claim of this church to possess that of which all other Christians were in search.

Of the report itself, he writes: "It is a most interesting historical document. Undoubtedly it is a great advance on the Lausanne Report. Those

who were present at both these world conferences say that at Lausanne what dominated was the anxiety of the delegates to insist on their own opinions, whereas here the desire to hear and understand the opinions of others prevailed. The report reveals a general desire to get to the bottom of outstanding problems and not to slur them over, though there is, at times, a vagueness which shows that a problem has been perhaps unconsciously overlooked."

A second point at which the present conferences registered progress over their predecessors was in the more accurate definition of the issues at stake. While this was true of both conferences, it was most gratifying in the case of Oxford, because there we were dealing with problems on which there is not only wide difference of opinion, but where we possess no body of sifted and tested information corresponding to that which is available in connection with the questions under discussion at Edinburgh. At Oxford, therefore, pioneer work had to be done. The surprising thing is not that complete unanimity was not reached, but that in the discussion of subjects of such highly controversial nature as the relation of Church and State, the responsibility of the Church in the field of economics, and the attitude of the Church toward war, such frank facing of the facts should have been possible and so fair a statement of the existing situation be achieved.

This gratifying result was due not only to the careful preparation made by the members of the Research Department and the group of eminent scholars whom they associated with them, but even more to the presence in Oxford of a group of laymen of exceptional experience in public affairs. The Chairman of the Commission on Church and State was Dr. Max Huber, a former Judge of the Hague Court, and now President of the International Red Cross. He brought to the work a wide international experience, and though the report was more condensed than the other four, it secured a degree of unanimity which was surprising, especially in view of the fact that it had to deal with the difficult questions at issue between the advocates of the system of Establishment and of the Free churches. When late at night of the last day the Drafting Committee completed its labors, one of the representatives of an important state church who had criticized some of our earlier drafts said to me: "You have given us something which we can take back to our home church as a real gift, a platform on which we can stand whatever issues may arise."

Even more significant was the result reached in connection with the

report which dealt with the Church and international affairs. Here the Conference was fortunate in having as its members a number of men who had first-hand acquaintance with the matters under discussion, men like Lord Robert Cecil, Lord Lothian, Professor Zimmern, John Foster Dulles, and Francis Sayre. The issue of pacifism was frankly faced, and it was found possible, in spite of deep-seated and honest differences of opinion, to agree upon a report which really said something significant and constructive.

But, indeed, this was true, even if in varying degrees, of all the reports. They represented a real meeting of minds, to which those who participated will look back as an enriching experience. One of my friends, a professor of exceptional brilliancy, confided to me that he had never learned so much in a similar period in his life as in the two weeks at Oxford. There was an honest effort to understand the other person's point of view and to bridge the gulf created by the existence of types of thought differing as widely as the American, the British, the Continental, and the Orthodox. The Barthians were well represented, but by no means had things all their own way.

In Edinburgh, there was less room for originality. But even here definite progress is to be reported. This was most noticeable in connection with the reports dealing with *The Grace of God* and *The Church and the Word*. The first of these dealt with the much-debated questions of freedom and determinism and of justification and sanctification, which in the past have so often split the Church. At Edinburgh, however, there was general agreement that these no longer present any adequate reason for disunion. In connection with the report on *The Church and the Word* also a large measure of agreement was reached. For this the Conference owes a debt of gratitude to Doctor Zoellner, the late venerable Superintendent of the State Church of Germany, who not only organized the Committee, but in the person of Doctor Stählin, its Secretary, brought to its service a mind of singular clarity and freshness. So far as any definition of the nature of the Church was attempted at Edinburgh, it was in connection with this report. Especially happy was its treatment of the connection between the Bible and tradition.

It is the more to be regretted, in view of the excellence of this contribution, that our friends of the German Evangelical Church could not be with us at either conference, though representatives of the Free churches were present at both. The Conference took note of the absence of the German delegates by a courteous message, carefully phrased so as to avoid controversial matter. This was unfortunately misinterpreted in Germany and

made the subject of extensive criticism in the German press. It is cause for gratitude, in view of this momentary tension, that at the first meeting of the Committee of Fourteen¹ in London immediately after the conclusion of the Edinburgh Conference, the German Church was represented by Bishop Heckel, acting in this capacity for Bishop Marahrens and with his consent.

The most disappointing part of the Edinburgh Conference's Report was the one which dealt with *The Ministry and the Sacraments*. This was due in part to the fact that it attempted to combine in a single statement subjects which had been wisely separated at the Lausanne Conference, but still more to the fact that by this combination it confused two entirely different interests: the theological and ecclesiastical interest of order and the religious interest of worship. Of this report alone, it must be said, as the Chairman, the Bishop of Gloucester, regretfully admitted, that it registered no significant progress over the conclusions arrived at at Lausanne, if indeed it did not take a step backward. This only can be said for it, that it made perfectly clear the fact that it is in connection with the matter of order alone that we face any insuperable obstacle of principle in the way of a united Church.

This is not to say that there are no other obstacles and that they are not formidable. But they are not obstacles of principle. One of the great merits of the discussions at Edinburgh was that they made it perfectly clear that many of the difficulties in the way of union are neither theological nor ecclesiastical, but cultural. A special pamphlet, prepared by the Commission on *The Unity of the Church in Life and Worship*, dealt with these non-ecclesiastical obstacles, and a long list they made. It is well that they have been brought out into the open and that we see clearly the whole problem that we face.

And this brings me to the third point in which the present conferences marked progress: their clear recognition of the lines along which the movement for unity must proceed. At Lausanne there was little attempt to distinguish between the different kinds of unity to be achieved. It was assumed that the unity of which we are in search is corporate unity and that when that is accomplished all will be well. But we have learned that this is not the case. There is more than one kind of unity which we must seek, even as there is more than one conception of the Church to be united. We may think of the Church as a spiritual society, the fellowship of all who share the life of

¹ A Committee consisting of seven from each conference authorized to prepare a plan for the proposed World Council of Churches and to arrange for its presentation to the churches.

the risen Christ and are committed to His service. Or we may think of it as the organization through which that fellowship is experienced and that service performed. These two conceptions, while clearly related, are not the same, and it can only do harm to confuse them.

One of the gratifying things about the Edinburgh Conference was its clear recognition of this difference and its acknowledgment that we have a responsibility for working for unity along both these lines. Until spiritual unity is realized, corporate unity can do little for us. Conversely, where spiritual unity is present, it is our duty to furnish it with the instrumentalities which it needs for its expression, and that without delay.

The presence of Dr. John R. Mott as a delegate to the Edinburgh Conference and his active participation in its discussions did much to focus attention on the practical issues which any one who takes church unity seriously must face. In contrast with the Conference at Lausanne, the closing section of the Edinburgh Report was given to the consideration of "Next Steps," and among these the important subjects of federation and of intercommunion had a place. When it is remembered that both these subjects were excluded from consideration at Lausanne, the progress made will be apparent.

But it was not only in their willingness to face the issues of intercommunion and of federation that the conferences were notable. At both definite forward steps were taken. At Oxford provision was made for a communion service celebrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, to which all baptized members of the churches represented in the Conference were invited. Those whose privilege it was to participate in this service, which was held in the historic Church of Saint Mary, will not soon forget the impression it produced. At Edinburgh too, provision was made for such a celebration; though here, as was natural in a Presbyterian environment, it was held in the Cathedral Church of Saint Giles. Through a regrettable confusion of dates, many of those who would have wished to attend this service were prevented from doing so. But the precedent was established, and it can safely be said that no future meeting of an ecumenical nature will be held without provision for a common celebration of the Lord's Supper.

It is true that this form of occasional communion falls short of the full intercommunion, which is the goal of the advocates of corporate union—communion, in other words, which ministers of different churches jointly celebrate. But it is not at this point that the most serious scandal in the

present situation is found. This scandal is the fact that there are still churches which refuse to admit to the sacrament sincere Christians of other communions than their own. It is safe to say that the Conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh have concentrated attention upon this scandal and, what is more, have pointed out the way by which it is to be overcome.

Still more marked was the progress made in the acceptance of the principle of federation. This appears most dramatically in the all but unanimous decision of both conferences to recommend to their constituent churches the establishment of a responsible World Council, to meet at stated intervals, through which the interests and activities now represented by the two movements called Life and Work and Faith and Order can be continued and unified.

How great a forward step this decision registers can be measured only by those who, like the present writer, have long been working toward this goal. There is something about a movement, after it has reached the stage of formal organization, which, like Frankenstein, seems to endow it with the capacity for independent and self-perpetuating life. And difficult as it has proved to unify separate branches of the Church, to unify the different movements for unity has been more difficult still.

The plan as finally adopted by the two conferences includes the following features: (1) A General Assembly of some two hundred members, directly responsible to the churches, to meet at intervals of five years. (2) A Council of some sixty members, of whom a third shall preferably be laymen, to serve as an Executive Committee of the Council, meeting annually. (3) The appointment of permanent commissions on Life and Work and Faith and Order to carry on the work now being done by the appropriate committees of the existing movements. (4) The provision of an intermediate period, during which the existing agencies will continue to function, and the request that the churches, in the manner and through the agencies which may prove most convenient, shall appoint a Provisional Committee of some sixty members to perfect the details of this scheme and bring it into effect.

Further clauses specify some of the functions which the World Council shall perform, provide for the definition of its relationship to other forms of the co-operative movement, such as the World Alliance, the International Missionary Council, and the Youth Movement, and include certain safeguards to protect the interests of the co-operating movements in matters of doctrine and of finance.

Should the churches adopt this plan certain great advantages will result. In the first place, it will provide for an organization which will do statedly and on a long-time program things which have hitherto been done sporadically and without a comprehensive plan. Secondly, it will make possible a more logical co-ordination of program and thus make a stronger appeal to the supporting churches. But above all it will give the unity movement a single center, which, bringing together all the larger non-Roman churches for co-operative activities, will appeal to the imagination of Christians and furnish the spiritual unity which now exists with an organ for its expression.

Looking back over the conferences as a whole, one would select the following as the significant features which determine the lines along which future progress must be made:

In the first place, we see more clearly the kind of unity which we seek. We realize that it is not enough to achieve church unity in the sense of visible corporate unity marked by the presence of a ministry officially recognized. It is still more important to achieve Christian unity in the sense of possessing a common spiritual life which makes the members of the different communions one in God's sight.

Secondly, we see that if our movement is to succeed, we must pursue the quest for unity along both these lines: both along the line of organic unity, technically so called, and the line of inward understanding and fellowship. Where fellowship is real, but lacks organization, we see that we must create some agency or agencies, recognized and approved by the churches, through which the measure of spiritual unity already reached can find visible expression.

Thirdly, we realize how important it is to lay the basis for any worldwide expression of unity, in either of these two forms, in corresponding national and local units, bringing together the Christians of each convenient geographical area for common worship, work, and witness.

Fourthly, we see that we must separate the matter of witness in the sense of the recognition of ministers (which is a question of order) from that of open communion (which is a question of worship); and that, pending the overcoming of the more serious difficulty of order, we must take steps to remove the scandal which now exists in the field of worship. In other words, we must provide for the admission of sincere and humble Christians, of whatever church connection, to the Lord's Supper, wherever celebrated.

Fifthly, we recognize that one of the greatest obstacles to effective

action along all these different lines is not so much the differences between communions as the differences between the parties and groups within each communion. There are Christians in all churches who feel nearer to their fellow Christians of other communions than they do to many members of their own church. This division within the churches prevents common action by the Church as a whole and is one of the most serious of existing obstacles to union.

To sum up, we perceive that our task in the ecumenical movement is not so much to create unity where it is absent (that is the work of God alone) as to discover ways of making visible the unity that now exists. The greatest thing the summer brought to us was that it revealed to us the extent of this existing unity and so gave us a fresh realization of the gift which God has given us in His Church as the one strictly universal fellowship in a world otherwise hopelessly divided.

This consciousness of the Church as a world-wide spiritual fellowship was most vividly present in worship. One of the delegates, himself a Congregationalist,² has recently described this rediscovery of the Church in worship. "In Saint Mary's in Oxford and later in Saint Giles' in Edinburgh, where we met daily for intercession, there came to us," he reports, "such a sense of spiritual oneness about the altar of God as to make all who partook of the experience mystically aware of the presence of the Church. That Church one, holy, catholic, appeared then in its beauty to eyes no longer holden; and all responded to the impulse of the same Spirit. There the richness which is in Christ was poured in lavish abundance and in its many forms of beauty . . . into the souls of worshippers."

It was not only in our experience of worship that we were conscious of unity. It was the background and presupposition of all that we did. And it was this sense of fellowship, across difference, because rooted in what was beyond and above all individual experience, that made Oxford and Edinburgh the unique gatherings they were.

Our primary duty, then, if we are to make our contribution as American Christians to the ecumenical movement, is to recover again that consciousness of the Church as a world-wide spiritual fellowship which we have so largely lost. Only in that recovered consciousness will we have a basis broad enough and deep enough for the superstructure that it must carry.

A second thing that follows from the summer's experience is the need

² Horton, Douglas, "Oxford and Edinburgh, 1937," in *World Christianity*, Fourth Quarter, 1937, p. 10.

of expanding our existing agencies of federation, both national and local, so that they may correspond to the basis which is proposed in the World Council of Churches which is contemplated. This would mean broadening the membership of the Federal Council so as to include Eastern Orthodox as well as Protestants and creating such relationships with the local federations that they will become organs of the ecumenical movement as a whole. Already a beginning has been made along both lines and there is good hope that we may see in the United States at least an organization which unites all the non-Roman churches.

In taking such steps to unify the American churches we shall be making our largest contribution to the life of the nation and ultimately to the family of nations. For what the world needs above all else is the demonstration that a truly ecumenical society is possible. Such a society the Church has been in name. Too often she has been anything but that in fact. Let Christians show not only in their individual lives, but in their corporate life that the fellowship of which they speak is real and they will bring hope to many who now feel estranged from all religion.

This is our answer to our Roman friends who point to Rome as the only church which possesses unity. Were we not convinced that God has already given us, in the communion of saints, a unity more after the mind of Christ than that to which Rome invites us, we should feel ourselves committed to a hopeless task. Having experienced this unity, in however limited a measure, through our fellowship with other Christians of like mind in the ecumenical movement, we thank God and take courage!

The Voice of the Church at Oxford

ERNEST FREMONT TITTLE

THE voice which spoke at Oxford was not merely the voice of some one or a few of the many Christian communions which are now to be found in the world. Still less was it the voice of any party or movement within the Church calling itself conservative or liberal, high or low. Nor was it merely a clerical voice, proclaiming the opinions and aspirations of a professional class; there were laymen present, and lay women, too. The voice which spoke at Oxford failed of being the voice of world-wide Christianity only by the regrettable absence of the Roman Catholic Church and of the Evangelical Church in Germany. As it was, it spoke out of forty-three nations through representatives of one hundred and nineteen communions, so that it requires to be taken seriously as an expression of Christian faith and the Christian conscience in the world of today.

The fact is worth stressing that this voice which spoke at Oxford was not the voice of ethical culture or of humanitarianism or of secular reform. It was the voice of Christian faith, addressing itself to the persistent, as well as the present, needs alike of individuals and of society. The brief, condensed message which the conference authorized to be sent to the churches of Christ throughout the world begins with the words, "In the name of Christ, greetings." Similarly, the five more or less lengthy reports which set forth the conclusions of the conference as to the function of the Church in the social order might properly begin with the words, "In view of our Christian faith in the revelation of God in Christ, we feel constrained to say these things." Read any one of these reports and you will find the language of religion, you will hear the voice of authentic Christianity, you will find yourself confronted with the purpose and demands not of men, but of God as revealed in Christ.

At Oxford it was not assumed that we are left to

"... stretch lame hands of faith, and grope,
And gather dust and chaff, and call
To what (we) feel is Lord of all,
And faintly trust the larger hope."

It was not assumed that God through all the ages has been inactive and incommunicative. It was believed that God has made Himself known to us men. In Jesus Christ He has both spoken and acted in such wise as to leave no reasonable doubt as to what He is like and what, on the plane of history, He is seeking to accomplish. To be sure, there is still room for speculation as to the word of God and the will of God in a given historical situation—plenty of room for that; as also for the acquisition of not a little exact knowledge such as may be gained by competent historians and scientists. Yet there is, after all, something for men to rely on besides their own minds working on the data of history, science, and individual human experience. There is God's revelation of Himself in Christ. That was the basic assumption at Oxford, as it is bound to be wherever Christian faith is profoundly held. And that assumption definitely influenced the formation of every judgment as to the duties of Christians and the function of the Church in the world of today.

There were some who from childhood had been conditioned to believe that the Church has little or no concern with the temporal order; it is only concerned with the inner life of the individual and his preparation for life after death. Yet no one, so far as my knowledge goes, attempted to take this position. In view of the present plight of the world, everyone found himself constrained by the love of Christ to propose something which might, under God, prove socially redemptive. And I learned of but one delegate who wanted to insist that the Church does all it may properly undertake to do when it faithfully labors to produce good individuals who, being good, will themselves undertake to improve the political, economic, and social orders of society. The Church, it was almost unanimously agreed, must hold itself responsible for the affairs of this world. It has an ethic of civilization, deriving from its faith in the revelation of God in Christ, which it must persistently declare and attempt to apply. It must strive to bring all human desires and all human activity under the reign of God, and this notwithstanding the possibility that it may never fully succeed in so doing. It must, of course, give moral guidance to the individual in every area of his life; but, more, it must undertake, in the light of its own faith, to pass moral judgment upon the existing arrangements of society and to indicate principles, standards, and goals for social action.

Moreover, this voice which spoke at Oxford was nothing if not realistic. It was realistic in respect of the situation which now obtains in the world,

noting the fact that "even in countries which are at peace unemployment and malnutrition sap men's strength of body, mind, and spirit, while in other countries war does its 'devil's work' and threatens to overwhelm us all in its limitless catastrophe." It had much to say concerning the presence of "demonic" forces in the world today—forces of evil that are now running amuck, without the consent of men's wills and often despite their most earnest desires, in a secularized civilization in which human institutions such as business, industry, and politics have denied or forgotten God and claimed for themselves an autonomous and absolute authority. Equally, it was realistic in respect of the situation which obtains in the interior life of the individual. It did not suppose that all the evil from which man suffers is occasioned by the environment in which he lives. Nor did it suppose that any improvement of social institutions will automatically result in an improvement of human personalities. It recognized the fact of sin, the evil will, the wrong choice consciously made. At Oxford there was no suggestion of Russian Utopianism; nor was any encouragement given to a facile optimism such as we Americans are prone to indulge in, failing as we also do to recognize the tragic fact of sin.

This thoroughgoing realism made for humility. There was no boasting, and any tendency to criticize other people was speedily squelched. Who were we that we should condemn Germany, either her people or her government? Had we not enough to condemn in our own nation and in our own lives? Had we not all sinned and come short—far short—of the glory of God? Nor was this attitude merely a pious pose. It might easily have been, but it was not. It was honest, and, which is more, it was intelligent, for it was born of the vision of God in Christ.

In the presence of God there was humility, but there was no despair. In the words of the report on *The Church and the World of Nations*, "We need not despair: the world belongs to God; to believe in His power and love is not to escape from reality, but to stand on the rock of the only certainty that is offered to men." At first a few voices were heard to suggest that sinful man can do nothing to improve the situation which he has himself created; he must wait for God to act. But these voices did not prevail. No one appeared to suppose that man is himself able to save his own soul, let alone the world; but clearly it was the belief of an overwhelming majority that there is much which, under God, even sinful men may and should undertake to do in the way of improving the present situation.

Now, it is obviously impossible in a single article to "report" what was said at Oxford. One may only indicate the scope and substance of important pronouncements on the function of the Church in relation to the national community, the State, the economic order, education, and the world of nations. This I shall undertake to do by lifting up a single utterance which, more often than any other, was heard at Oxford. Time and again it was said, "Let the Church be the Church"; the body, that is, of Christ, the enduring organism in which, in history, His spirit lives and speaks to the world and carries on its mighty work of individual and social redemption. In actual fact, organized Christianity has not always been "the Church," incarnating the mind of Christ. All too often it has been but the voice of a secular culture, echoing the opinions of a ruling class or the predilections of a comfortable and complacent middle class. In some cases, organized Christianity has actually repudiated ideas and ideals which undoubtedly reflect the mind of Christ. In others, it has given them but lip service or damned them with faint praise or handled them gingerly through fear of disastrous consequences to its own institution. Here and there it has fearlessly proclaimed them, but not always, alas! in a Christlike spirit. Hence the justification and meaning of this exhortation: "Let the Church be the Church."

I

The Church is now set in various races and nations where ties of blood, soil, and soul are very strong, and where it is almost fatally easy for men to forget, even to deny, that One is their Father, even God, and that they all are brethren. In this situation, however, let the Church be the Church. Let it rejoice in distinctions of race, recognizing in them "the purpose of God to enrich mankind with a diversity of gifts." At the same time, let it fully understand that all races, in the eyes of God, have intrinsic value—all, in the concern of God, share alike; and with that understanding let the Church refuse to tolerate racial pride, racial prejudice, or the persecution or the exploitation of any race. Especially in its own life and worship let the Church tolerate no barriers of race. And the conference recognized the fact that today there is special need for the Church, throughout the world, to "bring every resource at its command against the sin of anti-Semitism."

Likewise, let the Church rejoice in the existence of national communities with different customs and cultures, recognizing in them, also, the purpose of God to enrich and diversify human life. But let it be everlast-

ingly on its guard against the sin of an exclusive and arrogant nationalism: "Any form of national egotism whereby the love of one's own people leads to the suppression of other nationalities or minorities, or to failure to respect and appreciate the gifts of other people, is sin and rebellion against God who is the Creator and Lord of all peoples." Wherever set, let the Church be the Church, transcending all divisions and limitations of race and of nation, exhibiting in its own fellowship the glorious reality of God's concern for all mankind.

II

The Church is set in an economic order which now differs in different parts of the world, as Russia, Italy, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Great Britain, and the United States. In this economic order, of whatever character, let the Church be the Church. Let it not accept uncritically the principles and practices of any economic system. Let it examine them in the light of Christian faith as to the nature of God and man. Let it apply to them as a criterion of judgment the law of love revealed in Christ. This economic order in which the Church is placed, what is it doing to the bodies and souls of men? At a time when, thanks to science and technology, economic plenty is possible, is it providing for all men the necessities of life, so that none need ask in awful anxiety, What shall we eat, what shall we drink, wherewithal shall we be clothed? Is it giving to all men steady employment? Is it providing employment of such a character that men could, if they would, do the will of God in their daily work? Is it furnishing equality of opportunity in regard to education, leisure, health, and environment? Is it insuring that all children have, if not yet adequate, at least equal opportunities of physical and mental development? Is it giving to no man undue power over his fellows, so that there is little danger, on the one hand, of pride and ruthlessness and, on the other hand, of servility, born of fear, or of bitterness and suspicion, born of the belief that not justice but privilege, using force, rules the world? Is it stimulating a kind of motivation which is in harmony with Christian faith as to the meaning and goal of human existence? Is it discouraging a feverish scramble for money and a false respect for the victors in the struggle? Is it encouraging the belief, advanced by Christ, that man's fullest happiness, as also his true greatness, comes of loyal service to his kind and of persistent devotion to something greater than self—the purpose of God in history? In so far as

any given economic order is protecting and nourishing the bodies and souls of men, let the Church accept and rejoice in it. In so far as it is hurting the bodies or the souls of men, let the Church, in Christ's name, challenge it; and, further, speaking through its laity as well as its clergy, let the Church, after careful study and research, recommend concrete forms of economic practice which appear to be called for by the purpose of God as revealed in Christ.

Naturally, in view of its criterion of judgment, the conference found much to condemn in the present economic order of the industrialized world, which, it was recognized, makes for the enhancement of acquisitiveness, for manifold inequalities of opportunity, for irresponsible possession of economic power, and for the denial of the Christian's call to do the will of God in his daily work—a denial which appears not only in enforced unemployment, but also in certain forms of employment which involve deception, or which require the worker to produce things that are useless, shoddy, or destructive, or which leave him chiefly conscious of working for the profit of his employer and for the sake of his own wage and only indirectly, if at all, for any public good. Also, the conference demonstrated yet once again the familiar fact that it is easier to convict than it is to reform. It could not agree on any one proposal for the reconstruction of the economic system, some holding that the economic demands of Christian faith can be met within the framework of a system of private enterprise, others that they can be met only in a system based upon the social ownership of the means of production, and still others advocating the socialization of money and credit and the extension of the principle of co-operation through voluntary co-operative enterprises. At this point, however, the conference said several things worthy of note. It said that the Church would do well to repent of its own blindness to the actual situation in which millions of human beings, including many of its own members, are living—a blindness which has been exposed and rebuked by radical movements whose antireligious character the Church must forever deplore and oppose, but whose sensitiveness to injustice and whose concern for human beings it should have itself exhibited long ago. It said that the Church would do well to set its own house in order: "In regard to the sources of income, methods of raising money, and administration of property, as well as to the terms on which it employs men and women and their tenure of office, churches ought to be scrupulous to avoid the evils that Christians deplore in secular society." Noting the fact that, in the past, ecclesiastical

pronouncements have often failed to carry weight because of their all-too-obvious lack of technical knowledge, the conference urged more co-operation between clergymen and laymen engaged in industry, commerce, and public administration, suggesting also the need of permanent organs of study and research.

III

In the political sphere, likewise, let the Church be the Church. Christians, as all others, find themselves living in historically given states. Moreover, they are morally bound to uphold the State in its necessary task of providing security and of maintaining law and order in a world where sin has left its ugly, dangerous mark alike upon individuals and upon institutions and where change of one kind or another is bound to occur. In relation to the State, however, let the Church be the Church—a supernatural fellowship whose supreme allegiance is due to God and His purpose as revealed in Christ. This, of course, may involve the Church in opposition to the State. It is bound to do so in any case where the State is acting in flagrant disregard of standards of truth, justice, and mercy which represent the sovereign will of God, as also in any case where the State, ignoring the just claims of other States, is acting in disregard of the welfare of mankind. It will certainly do so in any case where the State is claiming for itself a divine status and power or ascribing an absolute value to a national or racial culture.

Even if war comes, let the Church be the Church. Meaning what? At Oxford five meanings were suggested. (1) Let the Church be unqualified in its condemnation of war, which “involves compulsory enmity, diabolical outrage against human personality, and a wanton distortion of the truth.” (2) Let the Church “call its members to confess their share in the common guilt of mankind for the continuance of war and the spirit of war among the nations.” (3) Let the Church “remind its members that the principle of the unconditional supremacy of the State or nation, advanced either in time of peace or of war, is incompatible with the Church’s faith in Jesus Christ as its only Lord and is, therefore, unacceptable as the final word of judgment or action.” (4) Let the Church “help its members to discover God’s will and then honor their conscientious decisions, whether they are led to participate in or to abstain from war, and maintain with both alike the full fellowship of the body of Christ.” (5) Let the Church “pray not only for the nation in which God has placed it, but also for the enemies

of that nation." Let it "proclaim and obey the commandment of the Lord, 'Love your enemies.'"

Also, to the end that war may not come, that it may one day be extirpated from the earth, let the Church be the Church—a universal fellowship transcending all national boundaries, all racial barriers; a fellowship constituted of men and women who, under whatever flag or system, acknowledge a supreme loyalty to God and His purpose as revealed in Christ; who are persistently seeking the welfare of their own nation, but never at the expense of any other nation; who are earnestly striving to remove from their own lives any attitude or practice which makes for war; and who, recognizing the fact that peace cannot be in a world which tolerates inequality and injustice, are seeking through peaceful change to bring about conditions, both within their own nation and among the nations, that will insure justice and at least some notable approach to equality of opportunity for all the individuals and peoples of earth.

At all times, in all places, let the Church be the Church—the body of Christ, an enduring, universal community in which His spirit may live and speak to the world and carry on its mighty work of individual and social redemption. What a vision! Yet it is not only a vision. To an amazing extent, even now, it is a reality. Thanks to the missionary enterprise of the nineteenth century and, above all, to the providence of God, there now are Christians in every part of the earth—not merely churchmen, but men and women who have in them that mind which was also in Christ Jesus. Moreover, these genuine Christians who are now to be found in every nook and corner of the world are beginning, at long last, to realize that they are not alone. Modern methods of communication, making possible a world-wide circulation of thought, along with modern means of transportation, making possible such world conferences as were held last summer at Oxford and Edinburgh, have thus also made possible this dawning realization on the part of Christians widely separated in space that they are by no means alone. There is now upon the earth a universal community representative of Christian faith and hope and love—a supernational, superracial community giving its supreme allegiance to God and determined to fulfill its mission in history, which is to incarnate, age after age, the spirit of Christ and thus to become the Body through which God, in some marvelous fashion, may answer the prayer of His people, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

After Edinburgh

HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL

IT is now twenty-seven years since the Faith and Order movement had its inception. Two great decennial conferences have been held and some of the ablest minds in the Church have worked through these years in preparation for these gatherings. What have we learned from these experiences? What advance has been made? Where do the crucial problems lie? What should be our next line of endeavor? Our immediate task, clearly, is to carry the spirit and message of Edinburgh to all our communions and congregations and to carry out the plan for a World Council of Churches. But there remains the central and original concern of Christian unity, and for this matter the questions raised above are primary. This paper addresses itself to these questions. Its thesis may be summarized as follows.

Underlying the many differences in doctrine and order which have appeared in these conferences are two basically contrasted conceptions, not simply of the Church, as stated in the Edinburgh report, but of Christianity itself. For want of better terms these may be called the institutional and the prophetic. So far our discussions have taken place within the framework of the institutional conception. We have made progress in discovering existent unity and in creating mutual understanding, but we have also found obstacles which Edinburgh came no nearer to overcoming than did Lausanne. These point to basically different interpretations of Christianity, and, quite as important, to contrasting conceptions of God and His relation to the world which underlie these. This problem must now be faced. We should no longer merely discuss details of difference and agreement, but raise the basic question as to the nature of Christianity, and particularly of our faith and our message. The result may be, not the abolition of detailed differences, but a truer understanding of what these mean, and a conception of church unity which will leave room for them within a common faith and fellowship.

CHRISTIANITY, PROPHETIC OR INSTITUTIONAL?

First of all it is necessary to define the distinction here made. The

terms prophetic and institutional are inadequate, but the distinction is clear and runs through the whole line of Hebrew-Christian development. The institutional conception is so designated because those who hold it believe that in Christianity there is something objective and definite which has been directly and in its given form instituted by God. In this they find the truth of God for faith, the will of God for life, and the way of God for salvation. As the gift and deed of God it is necessarily absolute, perfect, unchanging. Here they see the supernatural in our religion as against the merely human speculations and constructions elsewhere found. The clearest expression of this viewpoint is the ecclesiastical, and the Roman Church is its most logical and thoroughgoing exponent. For it the Church is a direct creation of God through Christ who committed to the Twelve and their successors absolute and infallible direction of men in matters of belief and conduct, and control of the means of salvation. But Catholicism in all its branches stands for this view, and in every case it sees the Church as thus established with supernaturally determined and necessary forms of ministry and sacraments, and with authoritative Scriptures and creeds.

The contrast, however, is not between Catholic and Protestant, for the institutional conception has been found in all branches of Protestantism. Here, however, the divinely "Given" has been found not in particular forms of ecclesiastical organization but in Scripture and doctrine. While the sacraments rightly administered have been viewed as a part of the divine institution, the stress has been upon the truth, the faith, the Word of God to man. The special form taken has commonly been a "high" doctrine of the Bible, not as bringing the Word of God to men, but as being the words of God and thus infallible in every part, and with this a stress on creeds and on an orthodoxy of unquestioning submission. In all these cases the interest is in finding something specific and objective which could be held as God's direct gift, as instituted by Him, and therefore to be accepted as absolute authority, and recognized as infallible and unchanging. Absolutism and authoritarianism are the marks of the institutional conception.

The second conception of Christianity I have called the prophetic. This term is also unsatisfactory, but seems to be the best simple designation available. Such terms as spiritual, personal, ethical, historical, are all pertinent here. With the Hebrews, priests, temple, sacrifices, and details of law represented something divinely established and so absolute and unchanging. The prophets did not reject them as such, but their conception of reli-

gion moved about a different focus. Not the institutional and static was central, but the living God, personal, ethical, revealed to men as righteous will commanding their lives, transcendent in holiness, but moving in human history to effect His gracious purpose. Correspondingly, religion meant for them a life of faith and righteousness expressed in the "Divine Community," the people of God. It was this religion, prophetic not priestly, that set the baseline for Christianity as Edwyn Bevan has pointed out in his *Christianity*. One sees this prophetic religion not only in the synoptic gospels, but in the Johannine writings and in Paul. It emphasizes the historical, personal, vital, ethical: God entering our history in a great deed of self-revelation and redemption, not merely in the words that Jesus spoke, or in His life viewed as example, or in His death as making forgiveness possible, but in a life in which God was present as truth and love and saving power. Whenever one comes to one of those great New Testament summaries in which the heart of the Christian gospel shines forth, the terms are invariably personal and ethical, not institutional. So with Jesus in His double law of love, in His "love—that ye may be children of your Father," and in the Lord's Prayer. So with Paul in his "by grace through faith," "faith working through love," "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Our New Testament, even in its admittedly second- and third-generation writings, shows no prescriptions as to correct sacramental procedure, as to necessary orders and form of organization, indeed, apparently no uniformity in these last, and certainly no philosophical definitions as to substance and nature, as to threeness and oneness, in anticipation of Nicaea and the Athanasian creed.

In its historical development, however, Christianity moved steadily toward the institutional type. The reasons for this were both historical and psychological: historical, for the faith of the fellowship needed formulation alike for purpose of proclamation and defense, a common worship demanded forms, the expanding life and activity increased the necessity of a definite order and of responsible leaders with allocated authority; psychological, for men tend almost inevitably to supernaturalize and absolutize that through which God speaks to them, the instruments through which they come into fellowship with Him. So it happened with the writings that brought the gospel, the creeds that summed up the faith, the sacraments, and the priesthood that ministered in holy things. These came more and more, in the particular form which they had assumed, to be viewed

as supernaturally determined, or instituted, and so as of the very essence of Christianity. And with this went a further reason. Man's supreme concern in religion is to find God in order that he may have life. To the common man the institutional form of Christianity offers two things in this search: first, something very definite, objective, *handgreiflich*; second, a claim to authority that offers relief from individual questions and doubt. It is significant that the communion which has gone farthest in these claims, the Roman Catholic, has today the greatest number of adherents. The evangelical reformation recalled men to the prophetic type, especially in its Pauline form, protesting against the institutional type in its ecclesiastical form, stressing the personal-ethical elements in its emphasis on grace and faith and in such writings as Luther's *The Freedom of a Christian Man*. But in its attitude toward the traditional creeds and more and more in its doctrine of the Scriptures, it retained the institutional element viewpoint, and the two elements have mingled in Protestant thought until this day.

EMPHASIS, NOT MUTUAL EXCLUSION

While this distinction is fundamental and illuminative of our situation, there is danger of over-simplification and misunderstanding. These interpretations are not mutually exclusive. The institutional conception does not rule out the personal and ethical and mystical. The Orthodox Church is as deeply mystical in its way as are the Quakers, who represent the extreme non-institutionalistic type. Anglo-Catholics are among those most interested in social questions and most radical in social views. Recent Orthodox writers, such as Boulgakov, have sought to indicate that a concern with social justice belongs to the Orthodox conception of Christianity. And within this institutional view, as history has made plain, is place for the prophetic summons to repentance and faith and righteousness. That there are dangers in this view for life and truth, dangers which come from institutional emphasis and development and from its concept of authority, is likewise made obvious by history. But our concern here is with the principles involved.

It is equally important that the prophetic view should be guarded from misconception. The reaction against the institutional view and the evils that have often accompanied it has led in turn to extremes. The revolt against external authority has sometimes brought individualism and subjectivism. The insistence upon the freedom of faith and the right of judgment

led to many of the divisions of Protestantism. The historical has been neglected because it had appeared as something rigid and unchanging, impervious to new truth and life. The revolt against an external supernaturalism, often mechanical and unethical, and against the neglect of religion's social implications, has led at times to extremes of humanism and moralism. But these evils are not involved in the prophetic conception of religion as such.

The prophetic conception does not mean individualism or atomism. It appreciates the corporate nature of Christianity. Indeed, with the principle of organicism there is a renewed emphasis on this point of view of which religion is the supreme exemplification. And the emphasis on the ethical and social supports rather than detracts from this position. Indeed, it extends this principle of the corporate or organic to give religious meaning to social expressions of life outside the Church. It has room, too, for a mystical conception of this corporate life of the Church. But it insists that, whether you think of man's attitude or God's immanent Spirit, the unity appears in a common life of love and faith and truth and the forms of its expression are secondary. It can, therefore, easily include in its fellowship the Quaker and the Salvation Army officer.

Nor can we say that the institutional conception stands for the divine significance of history while the prophetic conception ignores it and has room only for constant change. The former, indeed, turns our attention to the past, but what it seeks is some appearance in history which can be isolated and absolutized and set apart from the historical process. For the prophetic view the absolute is to be found rather in the living God who moves through history. It would accept the words of Archbishop Temple, at the Jerusalem Conference of 1928: "Whereas all other religions have tended to stereotype the conditions in which they originated, . . . Christianity has been a fermenting principle of change in every society into which it has come. This is primarily because it is centered not upon a formula, but upon a Person, and its regulative principle is not a code, but a Spirit. Moreover, it has stood committed to a doctrine of progress ever since our Lord Himself asserted the divine authority of the Mosaic law and yet superseded it with another, and Saint Paul, following where his Master led, asserted again the divine authority of that Law and abrogated it. To attribute divine authority to something for one period and deny it for another is to presuppose change and progress as part of the divine purpose." But this change, says Archbishop

Temple, goes with a real constancy, that of direction. "This is the constancy that the Gospel gives us. Our starting-point is fixed: it is the creative love of God. Our goal is fixed: it is the realized kingdom of God. And our way is fixed: it is found in Him who said, 'I am the Way.'" The unchanging is found not in the attempted isolation of some historical form, but in this God of creative good will who moves through history, and whom we know through Jesus Christ.

It is a mistake, too, to assume that the one side emphasizes divine sovereignty and grace, with man's sinfulness and impotence, while the other with its emphasis on the personal and ethical tends to stress human freedom and action and self-sufficiency; that the one sees only the principle of authority and submission while the other calls for man's own search and reflection and decision, stressing the idea of autonomy. These words suggest real differences, but the contrast is not so simple. The prophetic view is quite as insistent on authority, but it refuses to externalize it and to make it coincident in final and absolute fashion with some particular formulation—the letter of the Bible, a particular creed, an infallible pope or council. It makes the divine authority, in fact, more inclusive and more searching. It is just as insistent upon man's dependence and his need of grace, but it differs as to how that grace is mediated. It lays less stress upon particular rites performed by a particular group of men in an assumed historical succession. The decisive element for it once more is personal and ethical; where men bring to God the heart of humility and repentance and faith, there God bestows forgiveness and life, whether in Quaker meeting or at the solemn mass or in the oratory of the soul. And, indeed, active obedience and loving service may themselves be a means of grace, that is, an open door through which God brings life and help.

The discussion so far has made evident that underlying the crucial difference in these two views is a difference in the conception of the relation of God to the world, the way in which God enters our human life and acts upon it in His purpose to establish His kingdom upon earth. The common Christian faith is shared, of course, by both: faith in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who gives Himself in His Spirit. The difference, in part, is one of emphasis. In one case the transcendence and otherness of God are stressed, in the other the immanence and kinship. For both He is the living God, the God of action. But in one case the action is thought of as direct and unconditioned; in the other case the personal and ethical are emphasized, alike with

God and man, and so God's action is conceived as conditioned by man's response and as working out in the historical process. Correspondingly, in the former case the result is immediate, and what appears shares in the finality and absoluteness that belongs to God. In the latter case there is the element of the conditioned, the relative, the changing.

The two views spring from different aspects of religious experience. In the former case it is the sense of awe before God's holiness, of utter dependence in the presence of His absolute power. While the latter retains this, the significance of moral personality in God and man has entered in. God speaks, and asks not merely submission, but understanding; the preacher stands forth, not merely the priest and lawgiver. And what God wants is a new spirit and character and life in man, something that cannot come by magical means or irresistible power, not even by "irresistible grace." Here is the experience of religion as a morally conditioned fellowship; and this is given in such basic New Testament terms as grace and faith, and is made plain when we consider how grace is given and what the faith is that responds.

But while these distinctions are involved in the earlier prophetic faith as found in Old Testament and New, modern experience and reflection have made them clearer and have driven us to draw certain conclusions. The errors of modern naturalistic thought in religion, its psychologism and historicism and humanism, must not make us overlook the results of historical and psychological study, as well as of Christian reflection; and these are fatal to the externalisms and absolutisms of traditional religion. There is a simple and sincere faith which says: "Is not God all-powerful? Can He not do what He will? And what He does, must it not be perfect and final?" But a true humility will inquire how God actually works, and before such inquiries the infallibilities of Scripture and creeds and councils have given way. The absolute has not disappeared from faith, for then our faith itself would be gone, but we have found it not in the things of time, but in the Eternal Himself.

THE END OF A ROAD AND THE WAY OUT

These underlying differences must be kept in mind when we inquire what should come after Edinburgh. Thus far the approach to the goal of church unity has been made from the institutional viewpoint. We need now to note the nature of that approach, the progress made, the inevitable impasse, and the road that must be taken if church unity is to be secured.

1. It was natural that the background of Lausanne and Edinburgh should have been the institutional one. That is still the dominant conception, and we had to start from where we were. So the movement began with the underlying assumption of a series of individual items as to doctrine and institution conceived as divinely determined essentials for a true Church. The Lausanne statement on "The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel" rose above this, indeed. But under Anglican leadership the Church and its institutions were the subjects set for consideration, and agreement on the Nicene formula was accepted as a precondition to further conference. The scope of topics was widened at Edinburgh to include matters vital to the Lutheran and Reformed groups, adding the subjects of grace and faith and the Word of God; but the general approach remained the same.

2. From this standpoint we can understand the measure of progress that was made. We found ourselves one at Edinburgh in all that was most deeply personal and religious. We were most clearly conscious of that in worship. There was clear unity in the central object of our faith: one God of righteousness and mercy, one Lord who claimed our common allegiance and in whom God had spoken to us, one Spirit of the living God who had wrought in us this faith and this fellowship. Facing that dark world, the echo of whose tragic conflicts we could at no time escape, nor wished to, we were one in the glad conviction that in the Word of God in Christ was the one answer to its needs. But these central themes and their character as central were not the subjects of primary concern.

3. The limits of progress became equally clear. A notable degree of success attended the sections that sought a common formulation on grace and faith and the Word of God, but the differences that divided at Lausanne remained at Edinburgh. Every effort was made to overcome this. Agreement through better understanding and insight was the primary aim. Further, liberal evangelicals on the one hand and Catholics on the other made such concessions as they could, especially the former. Formulations were sought that would permit different interpretations, or formal agreement with reservation of differences, the statement about the episcopate being an outstanding example. The policy of the leaders seemed to be to avoid the discussion of issues that might bring out deeper differences and cause some groups to leave the conference. In other words real progress was made while at the same time the limits of progress became clear. The main line of separation lay plain: Here was a group for which an authentic Chris-

tianity and a true Church involved necessarily certain forms like the episcopate, certain creedal formulations like that of Nicaea, and a particular conception of the sacraments. Their intransigence at these points was not stubbornness or willfulness. It was for them loyalty to what God Himself had instituted and what man therefore could not change. But it meant an impassable barrier between them and those for whom the decisive matter in Christianity and so in the Church is the revelation of the spirit and will of God in Jesus Christ, the mediation of His Spirit and life to men, the expression of that Spirit in human life. For the latter all these elements in their given form were a matter of historical development, in their function instrumental. They too had convictions to which they must be loyal, but the difference lay here: for them there was a faith and a fellowship in which there was room for such differences since they did not touch the vital matters; for the others these matters were *de jure divino*, the institution of God, and their acceptance a condition of fellowship in one Church. So we face the ironic situation that the barrier to church unity is found in the position of those for whom organic union in one visible Church is involved in the very nature of the Church. Further, equally serious difficulties appear within the former group in the mutual relations of the different communions who share this general viewpoint. The agreement that some elements are essential because directly and divinely ordered does not involve agreement as to what these elements are. So Rome and Anglicanism and the various Orthodox communions are not in unity.

4. That is why a new beginning is necessary, a new approach to the problem. The Faith and Order Movement began with the courageous declaration that "the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we differ, as well as of those things in which we are at one." It is time now to test that position more thoroughly than we have as yet done. Consider some of these back-lying questions which have not come up for thorough consideration. There is the question of authority. There was some consideration of the relative authority of Scripture, creeds, and tradition at Edinburgh, but the basic problem as to the nature of authority in religion was not attacked. Clearly, however, if you hold the authoritarian view which underlies the institutional conception of Christianity, if you believe that certain definite positions have been divinely transmitted and must be accepted on authority, this general question as to the nature and basis of authority in religion cannot be avoided. The changed

conception as to the use of the Scriptures and the discussions among Anglo-Catholics themselves as to the authority of the Church reveal this necessity.

Similarly we must attack the question of the bearing of historical study upon our conception of Scripture, creeds, and ministry. The results of such study are likely to have a decisive meaning for our position. What we want is truth, not merely success in offensive and defensive warfare over our various positions. The influence of historical study upon our ideas of the authority of the Scriptures is generally recognized. The authority of the letter is gone. We no longer have the right to settle matters by indiscriminate appeal to the letter. Yet no indication of this was given in the citation of Scripture and the declaration as to its authority at Edinburgh. The distinguished Swiss theologian and Biblical scholar, Eberhard Vischer, protested against this, but nothing came of his protest. Even more important is the bearing of historical study upon the question of the episcopate. No formula could overcome the basic difference in position of episcopal and non-episcopal groups. That difference becomes clear when we penetrate below the phrases used in the report. The episcopal groups have in the historic episcopate something which is for them not a mere means of expressing the unity of the Church or securing efficiency, but rather a *de jure divino* requirement and therefore essential to a true Church and a valid ministry. This explains why the promising South India plan has come to a stop, and why the rich progress of recent years as outlined in Doctor Douglass' report at Edinburgh includes no instance of a union between Anglican and free churches. Yet at no point was there any intimation at Edinburgh of the bearing of historical study upon these underlying presuppositions.

One other instance is the bearing of historical study upon the nature and use of creeds. Here is another problem which cannot be avoided if we are to secure unity. After Lausanne set forth its great interpretation of the Christian faith in "The Church's Message to the World," it felt it necessary to affirm a confession of faith "witnessed to and safeguarded in the Ecumenical Creed, commonly called the Nicene, and in the Apostles' Creed." The purpose of this was presumably to secure for the Conference the presence of those who felt they could not even discuss unity unless these formularies were first agreed to. The carefully chosen terms as to the function of these creeds, "witness" and "safeguard," would seem to have been intended to make it easier for some to accept this declaration. The fact remains that it

has been assumed that the particular theological formulation of the doctrine of the Person of Christ adopted in 381 has such absolute authority that it must be accepted as a pre-condition of admission to a conference on Christian unity. But historical considerations cannot be excluded here. Is this a place where by direct divine action in absolute and infallible form a permanently authoritative doctrine was handed down? It is an interesting fact that it was a delegate of the Orthodox Church who pointed out that the Nicene Creed was the joint product of Greek philosophy and the Christian faith. But the implication of this remark of Professor Alivisatos seems to have escaped both him and his group. The Nicene creed, like other formulations, is the effort of men to express the Eternal in the forms of time, in this case in the forms of Greek philosophy current in the fourth century. Large numbers of Christians who hold this faith believe that it can be better expressed in the more personal and ethical terms which a prophetic religion employs than in the impersonal abstractions of nature and substance which were the current coin of that philosophy.

NEXT STEPS

Here then is a proposal for the next step after Edinburgh. There are several important tasks upon which there seems to be general agreement. First, the results achieved at Oxford and Edinburgh must be carried over into our several communions and communities. Second, we must continue the efforts at co-operation, federation, and organic union which have made such progress in recent years. Further, the plan of a World Council of Churches must be put into effect. But something more is needed. The continuation of those preparatory studies which were so vital to Oxford and Edinburgh is part of the general plan already set forth. What is suggested here is that the scope of such studies shall be extended, that they shall go back to underlying issues such as have here been indicated, and that ultimately the results shall come up for consideration in ecumenical conference. It will not be enough once more to discuss the nature of the Church, or orders, or sacraments, or to take up seriatim any other points of agreement and difference. We must ask critically what it is that underlies these differences and that has blocked the way to unity, with a willingness to consider such fundamental issues as the nature of authority, the conception of God and His relation to the world, and the bearing of historical-critical studies upon our traditional conceptions. Above all, we must consider constructively what is this

Christian faith of ours, what it is that divides us from the paganisms of our day, and what the message is that we have to bring to our world.

The first question to arise will undoubtedly be, "Will not this disrupt the movement?" It has been difficult enough to hold in line the groups of the extreme "institutionalist" right. The answer is that this is first of all not a proposal of a basis of unity, but simply one of exploration and study. It does not even involve decision as to the agenda of the next conference. It simply suggests lines to be pursued in the kind of work that was so fruitful in preparation for the 1937 conferences. If there be talk of alienation let us remember two facts. First, we cannot secure unity by avoiding issues or covering up differences with carefully compounded phrases. Second, there are other groups within the Church that we are in danger of alienating. At Edinburgh the delegates were largely either higher ecclesiastics or men who were chosen by these. And with these the institutionalistic approach tends to predominate. Groups of the liberal evangelical type had none too large representation, and those who were present showed the usual liberal tendency to interpret generously and to concede freely, or kept silent because so many of the subjects considered were not the crucial ones in the case and the policy of the leaders strongly discouraged the bringing in of other matters. But the strength of our free churches in large measure consists of people who unite an open and inquiring mind with real Christian faith and devotion; that is especially true of the men entering the ministry today. There would be little use in a movement which did not carry these along with it.

The other objection comes from both right and left: "This will take us into the field of theology, deepen our differences, involve us in endless discussion, and remove us from the central issues of faith and life." The objection would have come with more force a few years ago. Nineteen hundred and thirty-seven has shown us the need in social action as in church life of clear, courageous, and thorough theological thinking. The final battle today is one of world views—Communist and Fascist have both recognized this and are moving accordingly. Not only the unity of the Church, but its service to the world and its very life are dependent upon a strong faith, held with a clear sense of its great meanings and an equally clear awareness of its problems as it faces this age.

Will not this take endless time and defer the unity which is so urgently demanded? Here we must stop to consider what the real enterprise is upon which we are engaged. We may well distinguish between the present, the

proximate, and the ultimate. The present shows a large degree of unity which we already possess. There are proximate steps, many of them, that we can take to bring that unity to consciousness, to further the ecumenical spirit, and to increase the forms of its expression. But the ultimate goal is not something formal or institutional. It is a unity in truth and faith, in love and work, an inner unity coming to visible expression. Such unity can only come as the whole purpose of God is fulfilled, as His kingdom comes increasingly on earth.

What may be expected from such a continued and thorough-going study as has been here proposed? I believe that our free churches of the West have much to learn from those who follow the Catholic tradition: the corporate nature of religion, the meaning and method of worship, the place of tradition in relation to faith and authority, and the meaning of ecumenicity are instances in point. I believe that the prophetic conception also has much to offer, and not simply as to the nature of personal religion but as to the way to unity. The institutionalist viewpoint from its very nature must insist upon particular formulations of faith and order. Rome is the extreme but logical expression of this position. The prophetic view recognizes these differences, but asks us to consider whether the heart of our faith and the ground of our unity may not lie elsewhere. Laying the emphasis upon the personal, it points to Christ as determinative for the nature of Christianity, Christ as the revelation of God, as the Word that speaks God's will for our life and God's grace for our salvation. Here is that which unites us, and here is the line, distinct and deep-running, that separates Christianity from the secularisms and paganisms and unbeliefs of our day. Of course, this is a difference in viewpoint, and the prophetic group has no right simply to say: Accept our position and give up your own. What it can say is: Explore these matters with us. See if this be not the basic difference. Consider with us which way it is that God has taken to come to men, to express His will, to give men life.

One point needs special emphasis. Under the influence of the Lausanne-Edinburgh method of piecemeal consideration there is a good deal of discussion about the particular differences which remain to be removed, or the tensions that await resolution. What we need to see just now is that differences and even tensions will remain, and that there is a Christian unity which has place for them. As regards the differences, they were present in the Apostolic Church, and in Christian history the method of enforced uniformity has tended to create schism rather than secure unity. Our immediate need

may be a larger view as to the possible place of such differences in the one Church of Christ.

The question of "tensions" is a somewhat different matter. Specific tensions may become divisive in church life and destructive in the life of the individual, but they may also root in something ultimate and enduring and belong to life itself. The basic principle of polarity must be reckoned with here. Many tensions have their source in this, and thus have a legitimate and permanent place in life. The prophetic conception of Christianity, emphasizing the living process and not the static form, gives place to these. Basic is the tension which appears in the contrasted emphasis, now on the divine in its absoluteness, its all-sufficiency, its all-determining action, and now on the human with its freedom and responsibility. Even when the extremes are avoided, the tension remains. Independence and dependence, moral freedom and determinism, Calvinism and Arminianism, activism and quietism, social gospel and apocalypticism, these are variants of a general theme. So we have the emphasis on tradition and authority over against the spirit of experimentation and exploration, the stress on the individual and that on the corporate, to name but a few. They rest back upon a polarity that belongs to life itself and are not to be resolved by eliminating one side or the other, or by moving on to a Hegelian synthesis, or by the rather mechanical device of "both and." Our problem does not lie in these tensions, nor is any idea of church unity acceptable which does not leave room for them. In tensions like these, challenging us now this way, now that, denying easy rest, whether in thought or life, there are found the spring of life and the richness of the Christian truth and way.

As Seen By a Layman

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

LARGE conferences are usually to be avoided. Intellectual advancement is apt to be in inverse ratio to the number of those participating therein. And while the massing of human beings facilitates the generation of emotion, that is a quality with which we are today surfeited. Nevertheless, I attended the Oxford Conference because it seemed to me that I might there find the answer to certain questions which perplexed me.

I am a layman, of Christian upbringing. Despite the fact that my beliefs are somewhat diluted, I have always assumed, as a matter of course, that it was the Christian churches which could be looked to to lift mankind from those morasses of which the underlying cause is usually moral decay. But recently I had begun to doubt.

At few times in history have human needs been so great as during recent years. The World War had destroyed material and spiritual values to a degree which has only gradually been appreciated. Every country faced a long period of readjustment which tried the souls of men. It was obvious that the situation called for some constructive and directive force, based upon recognition of a common need rather than merely that of self or community or even nation. Instead of this, in international affairs, those nations which were dominant sought to perpetuate for themselves a monopoly of the advantages which they had derived from the successful prosecution of power politics. Those nations which felt themselves wrongfully disadvantaged, sought to redress the balance at the expense of others still weaker. Within the State, class warfare was waged in the effort of some to obtain, and of others to retain, such relatively small amounts of accumulated wealth as existed in transferable form. All of this occurred in states which were nominally Christian and where public opinion was dominated, and public leadership exercised, by those who were members of Christian churches.

Deep troubles usually produce a new order of thinking. Thus, in certain areas, there emerged new political and spiritual conceptions. The "State" was personified, even deified, as the sole source of human salvation. To the State's chosen objectives all else was to be subordinated, including the privilege of individual judgment and action. The State not only claimed

complete allegiance, but demanded of its followers those Spartan qualities necessary to make them most useful in the State's scheme of things.

These new creeds promptly came into conflict with the Church. In retrospect we can see that this was inevitable. Nevertheless, at the time, the conflict took us rather by surprise. We could look back over a record of centuries throughout which the Church had successfully maintained its right to teach allegiance to Christ as superior to any secular loyalty. At many times the struggle had been bitter and had entailed heavy sacrifice. But the Church had historically shown such vitality in defense of this principle that it came to be assumed that politicians would never again find it expedient to challenge the Church upon this issue.

However, as is usually the case, it is when we feel most secure that the greatest danger is present. It had doubtless become apparent to any astute observer that the churches had lost those qualities which in the past had made them formidable. No religion can survive which does not demand and receive sacrifice from its adherents. Sacrifice is not only the measure of loyalty, but itself induces loyalty. We believe intensely only in those causes to which we have contributed of ourselves. But the churches, it seemed, had become "soft." It had become conventional and even socially and materially advantageous to become an enrolled Christian. No risk and no sacrifice were involved. Church membership had ceased to be synonymous with dangerous and difficult living for a high ideal. This inspiring concept had been dropped by the wayside for others to take up and incorporate in their own authoritarian programs. Christianity was thus fought with weapons abandoned by it from its own armory. In the resultant struggle, the churches in many countries were pushed aside with surprising ease.

In the face of such occurrences it is not, I think, surprising that many should have lost confidence in the Church as institutionalized by man. Its weakness and ineffectiveness seemed to prove that it had too much devoted itself to vain repetitions and too little to doing the Father's will.

It was under such circumstances that the Oxford Conference was held. It was attended by delegates from practically all of the Christian churches except the Roman Catholic Church, but including the Greek Orthodox Church. The delegates, numbering some four hundred, were drawn from virtually every land and race and represented all shades of political

opinion. The program of the Conference involved five basic topics of discussion:

(1) The Church and the Community, with particular regard to barriers created by social distinctions and racial differences.

(2) The Church and State, with particular regard to the distinctive functions of the two and the duty of Christians when Church and State come into conflict.

(3) The Church and the Economic Order, with particular regard to the duty of the Church in relation to the attainment of social justice.

(4) The Church and Education, with particular regard to the duty of the Church to impart religious education and the co-ordination thereof with secular education.

(5) The Church and the World of Nations, with particular regard to the attainment of an international order which might eliminate war. As a subdivision of this topic was included the question of the Christian duty if, despite all efforts to prevent war, it nevertheless occurs.

Each of these subjects was discussed in detail by sections of the Conference. The section membership was selected with a view to securing for each topic the best qualified minds available, but also with a view to assuring that each topic would be developed by a group which, from the standpoint of race, creed, nationality, and political viewpoint, would be a fair cross-section of the Conference as a whole. Each section then drafted a report which was then submitted to the entire body of delegates. Each of the five reports was approved with substantial unanimity. The reports were adopted, not as binding ecclesiastical pronouncements, but as representing the best statement of Christian attitude which it was possible for the Conference to arrive at within the time and with the facilities at its disposal.

It is not my purpose here to summarize or to review the reports themselves, although I shall later revert to certain passages for the purpose of illustration. To some extent, as was inevitable, the reports are platitudinous; to some extent there were concessions to expediency in that words were chosen with a view to covering up differences which developed. To a considerable extent the reports devote themselves to condemning admitted evils. In this respect they are without particular value. It is easy to wax eloquent in denunciation of war and social injustice. But the danger of pursuing this course is that too often those who denounce feel that they have thereby fully discharged their duty.

But if the reports show evidence of human frailties, they are none the less documents of profound significance. Each of them contains an analysis, which is both intelligent and realistic, of great problems which today face the world. Each suggests, in relation thereto, a concrete and constructive approach which, if sincerely adopted by Christians, would go far to make possible a solution.

I illustrate by reference to the report of the Fifth Section dealing with international relations. The report goes deeper than a facile denunciation of war and eulogy of peace. It develops the fact that where, within a country, domestic tranquillity is on a firm basis, this is only because of the existence of a superior force—Government—which is able and disposed, by new legislation, to adapt from time to time the social structure to changing social needs. In the world of nations no superior political agency exists. This means that change, which is always inevitable, can occur only through force or the voluntary action of the nations. "It therefore particularly devolves upon Christians to devote themselves to securing by voluntary action of their nations such changes in the international order as are from time to time required to avoid injustice and to permit equality of opportunity for individuals throughout the world. . . . The unequal distribution of natural advantages is one of the causes of war, if control is used to create a monopoly of national advantage. Christian people should move their Governments to abstain from such policies and to provide a reasonable equality of economic opportunity."

"Christian influence," it is noted, "cannot be made effective without adequate factual knowledge. To meet this initial need, Christians should take measures to obtain information on world conditions more adequate and reliable than that now furnished by secular and nationalistic agencies, which are too prone to ignore or belittle the needs of alien people, or to express those needs in terms of sacrifice to be made by nations other than their own. Once the need of change is apprehended, its accomplishment depends upon governmental action. This will require of statesmen and politicians a broader vision than now exists of the true welfare of their nation. The heads of States, under whatever form of Government, are ultimately dependent upon the support of their people, who must make it clear that they are prepared to accept temporary sacrifices in order that a greater good may ultimately emerge."

.

From the nature of the reports and the unanimity with which they were adopted, I draw certain conclusions:

(1) Christianity as exemplified by the church leadership represented at Oxford is still vital. The reports, as I have pointed out, deal realistically and deeply with highly controversial problems. They were drafted by men differing in nationality, race, culture, creed, social position, and political affiliation. It would have been utterly impossible to secure agreement had there not been some controlling common denominator. That common denominator was found to be present. It was a genuine belief in Christ's life and teachings as the guide to human conduct.

I can emphasize this point by reference to another conference. Immediately preceding the Oxford Conference, I had attended at Paris the biennial meeting of the International Studies Conference. The topic of study was "Peaceful Change," the same topic as that dealt with by that portion of the Oxford report from which I quoted above. The Paris Conference was made up of students and men experienced in public affairs drawn from substantially the same nations as were represented at Oxford and selected to represent the best contribution which each country could make to an unofficial, dispassionate, and scholarly study of the chosen problem. No attempt was made to arrive at any agreed report. It was, however, apparent from the discussions which took place that it would have been impossible to agree either as to the nature and scope of the problem itself or the proper approach to its solution. Certainly not more than a small fraction of the delegates would have been willing to subscribe to such a statement as that which emanated from Oxford.

Each of the differing national viewpoints represented at Paris was also represented at Oxford. Only a powerful influence could have obliterated those differences. That this obliteration occurred at Oxford is clear evidence that the Christianity of those present was more than a name—it was a vital living force.

(2) A second conclusion which I draw from Oxford is that the churches are peculiarly qualified to promote a solution of the kind of problems which today vex mankind. These problems are not, like mathematical problems, susceptible of an abstract, static solution. They require a dynamic solution, involving transition from one condition of affairs to another. If there be agreement upon the ultimate goal, then the way of solution becomes revealed. In this regard the churches have a great opportunity. They represent an

important cross section of all mankind which, in theory at least, has a single, permanent and all embracing objective, namely, that human affairs be so ordered that "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

The ineffectiveness of political agencies derives largely from the concept of "corporate responsibility." For example, directors of companies cannot, as a matter of existing law, indulge in generosity or largesses except as they believe that the stockholders whom they represent will gain a material advantage therefrom in the form of enhanced company profits. Directors who use company assets to promote their conception of "social justice" are acting unlawfully, and are personally liable to make good to stockholders if any material loss is occasioned them thereby. Directors may do what they please with their money, in their personal capacity, but they cannot indulge in idealism at the possible expense of others for whom they are trustees. A similar point of view prevails with respect to those who hold public office. They are apt to be considered, and to consider themselves, as trustees, not of the general welfare of humanity, but of the particular electoral group they represent. A United States Congressman may hesitate to vote to forgive the Allied war debts. He may feel that this is equitable and in the general interest. But he acts in a representative capacity and, as such, is he authorized to give away sums which, if collectible, would belong to his constituents? A Governor may have been elected primarily by the votes of the so-called "submerged groups." Is it then his duty to seek their advantage without regard for the welfare of those who may previously have "emerged"? Hitler has been made leader of Germany to help the Germans, not the Czechs, and should a solution of their problems enter into his calculations?

Whatever the proper view may be as to so-called "corporate responsibility," and as to this the Oxford Conference made no pronouncement, the fact is that this concept is deeply rooted. This is serious when problems are so vast as not to be solvable by those who feel that they owe a duty of allegiance to certain groups alone. But in the eyes of God, all men are equal and their welfare is of equal moment. This is distinctively the Christian approach and it is only through an approach of such universality that there is any promise of a solution. This, I think, was made apparent by the Oxford reports. It was not that the Oxford Conference discovered any new and clever formulae for the quick solution of stubborn problems. But it went far in showing that problems which otherwise seemed unsolvable

became susceptible of solution if approached from the standpoint of the universal brotherhood of man.

I do not mean to suggest that organized Christianity is the only instrument through which our problems may be solved or, as a corollary, that it is futile to seek to eliminate wars and social unrest and injustice until the whole world has first become Christianized. There was no disposition at Oxford to contend for such a proposition, or to deny the contribution which other religions and philosophies and social agencies can make toward a solution of our human problems. The Christian churches are powerful for good in so far as they propagate spiritual truths. It is the truths which are important, not the name, and those truths often appear under alien guise. As such they should be recognized and welcomed and co-operated with. But the Christian churches are unique in their combined qualifications. Not only are they founded upon a concept of universality, but they have in fact attained this to a degree permitting them to approach every problem with understanding of the diverse underlying national and social conditions.

(3) If the Oxford Conference showed the unique potentialities of the Christian churches, it also exemplified the restraints necessary to prevent the churches becoming enmeshed in partisan politics. The Conference did not claim for its reports the imprimatur of divine, or even ecclesiastical, authority. The reports themselves were, in the main, limited to analyzing problems to a point which made evident the spiritual failures which caused them. There was no advocacy of particular political solutions. This was sound, for specific measures will almost always involve matters of close judgment and of expediency and will seldom be such an embodiment of Christ's teaching that the Church can permit the two to be equated. Christ, for example, told a certain rich young man to give all he had to the poor. But this gives us no clue to how far the State should go in taxing those who have for the benefit of those who have not. Normally, the State should not attempt this to such a degree as to impair the functioning of the economic mechanism and thereby increase the net amount of need. But at this point we are involved in economics, not religion, and, as said in the Oxford Conference report on the Church and the Economic Order, "every tendency to identify the kingdom of God with a particular structure of society or economic mechanism must result in moral confusion for those who maintain the system and a disillusionment for those who suffer from its limitations." This, however, does not mean that the Church and State live in separate compartments.

There must be communication. Normally this will be through the churches so impressing spirituality upon the individual that his secular life will be affected thereby. It is notably in this respect that the churches have failed and their first task is to make good this failure. Secondarily, and under special circumstance, the churches can accelerate and orient the reaction of the spiritual upon the secular by analyzing human problems so that the individual can more readily apply a spiritual test to political measures. But this must be attempted with caution. The Oxford Conference was so constituted as to make such an attempt permissible. There was present a wealth of knowledge and experience drawn from every nation, race and social order. This was made available and utilized in a spirit of profound consecration. Such a combination of secular knowledge and spiritual consecration is indispensable if the churches are to attempt even an analysis of political and economic problems. Too often spiritual and secular motives become unconsciously mixed, and it requires unusual practical experience to detect the pitfalls which the worldly constantly prepare to secure for themselves the appearance of church benediction.

(4) I have already referred to the extent to which the differences represented at the Conference were submerged by a vital common denominator. This occurrence was indicative not merely of vitality, but it also demonstrated an amazing unity of thought and interpretation on the part of the different Christian denominations. There persisted, of course, the well-recognized differences of approach and emphasis which flowed from different ecclesiastical views and different conceptions of worship. No attempt was made to deal with or to eradicate such differences. Indeed, I think the generally prevalent view was that such differences were healthy and useful to preserve. Men worship God in different ways and interpret revelation in terms that vary according to education, race, and culture. But there emerged a unity in defense against pagan beliefs and a unity in offense against the problems which, if left unsolved, will inevitably destroy the Christian churches and prove that their name is a misnomer.

The necessity for such unity was strikingly attested by the situation of the Evangelical Church in Germany. Representatives of this great body of German Christians had planned to attend and participate in the proceedings of the Conference. At the last moment difficulties were placed in their way by the German Government. The Conference was, however, fully informed with reference to the German situation. It knew of the trials and tribula-

tions to which were subjected those ministers of the Gospel who felt bound by conscience to oppose publicly those doctrines of the Nazi Party which seemed to make allegiance to State superior to allegiance to God. The influence of this upon the Conference was profound. It vividly revealed that dangers threaten which overshadow the differences which divide the churches and it inspired an attitude of co-operation which, if perpetuated, should greatly promote effectiveness. Again it was demonstrated that the "blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church."

.

I had prepared for the Oxford Conference a paper entitled "The Problem of Peace in a Dynamic World," which was reprinted in a previous issue of RELIGION IN LIFE. In concluding that paper I said that the major obstacles were created by pride and selfishness and that these could be got rid of "only by replacing them by some sentiment more dominant and gripping and which will contain in it the elements of universality as against particularity." I asked "What of the democratic nations? What of the so-called 'Christian' nations? They boast of high ideals, but have they the spiritual fire with which to drive out the petty instincts which bind them to a system which spells their doom?"

Since having attended the Oxford Conference, I think it possible that this question can be answered in the affirmative. It requires, however, that the spirit of Oxford should not die down, but be projected through the membership—particularly the lay membership—of all our churches.

The Ecumenical Movement and the Younger Churches

WILLIAM PATON

A VISITOR to the United States can scarcely doubt the existence of the "ecumenical movement." Magazine articles, the reports of innumerable addresses, and most of all the intercourse he may enjoy with delegates to either or both of the conferences held at Oxford and Edinburgh will convince him that there is present among many of the leaders of American Christianity, and not least among the younger of them, a genuine appreciation of the fact of a world-wide Christian fellowship and a keen desire that the distinctive kind of contribution that American Christians have it in them to make to that fellowship should be made. To anyone who has the slightest appreciation of the realities of the religious situation in the world today this fact must appear as of the very highest importance.

It has been noted in many of the public comments on the two conferences held during the recent summer that the share taken in them by the representatives of the "younger Churches"—to use the locution which has become common since the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council—was small. What there was of it was highly distinguished; nor is it to be wondered at that with another world meeting, in which they would be primarily concerned, to follow in the succeeding year, the leaders of the younger Churches should not have been present at Oxford and Edinburgh in any force. But it would be a calamitous thing if there were to be in the Western countries and among the leaders of Christian thought and action in them any failure to recognize that to the full success of an ecumenical Christian movement the help of the younger Churches and of the missionary movement in which they are bound up is essential.

The ecumenical Christian movement is a combination of three things. It is a movement for the mobilizing of Christian thought upon the characteristic problems of our time, particularly as they bear upon the distinctive Christian understanding of life and may in turn be illuminated by that understanding. It is a movement toward the unity of the entire Christian Church, not so much for the engendering of specific schemes for unity—a task best left to the representatives of churches which are considering closer relationships

—but for the probing of those deep and ancient causes of division, often not superficially obvious, which underlie our present ecclesiastical condition. It is a movement for action in such matters as demand common action. Here the movement is most tentative, for the ground is least explored and mistakes, with their consequence of loss of common confidence, are most easily made. But whether we think of the succoring of weak and distressed churches, or of those secular matters in which it may be a plain Christian duty to organize the Christian conscience into overt expression, there is surely a place for action as well as for common thought. To these three aspects of the movement we might add a fourth, were it not that it arises from and is present in all three. This is the creation of the ecumenical Christian mind. This is a formidable expression, and he would no doubt be a bold man who said that he possessed such a mind. One of the results of the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences—and in the eyes of many not less significant than any published findings or affirmations—was that a considerable number of Christian people of differing countries, cultures, theologies and also prejudices had grown nearer to one another. They had not abandoned the homes from which they set out, but they had both supplemented and enriched their own thought. They had caught a glimpse of a Christian world community; they might be still conscious of tension between widely different points of view among Christians, but they knew themselves to be caught up in a unity to which those very tensions contributed something. They could never again be content with a self-satisfied insistence upon inherited positions nor regard such an insistence as a full discharge of their duty as Christians.

It is reasonably certain that the proposals for the formation of a World Council of the Churches, already outlined at Oxford and Edinburgh and to be given shape and detail as the months go on, will crystallize the movement as nothing else has done and make it something of which not merely a small inner ring of men and women in different countries but the Churches in a far wider sense will become conscious. It was a hopeless business to explain to people who had not an appreciable amount of leisure to devote to the subject how the Faith and Order Movement differed from the Life and Work Movement; what was the International Missionary Council and where the World Alliance came into the picture; how the World's Student Christian Federation and the two great Youth Associations were related to the rest. Behind the façade of all these movements, taken together, there has grown up a remarkable amount of common purpose, common trust and sense of

common obligation. We are at the beginning of a new period in the life of non-Roman Christianity, when the sense of belonging to a world community will become more and more conscious among Christians.

To such a movement what can the younger Churches and the missionary movement contribute? Let it be freely confessed that of theological learning they have far less than the older communions which supplied the great bulk of the delegates at Oxford and Edinburgh. Mostly these Churches are both small and young, in most of them the lines of their life and thought and the modes of their organization are derivative from the old Churches of the West. The fact that they are so largely foreign in life and so little racy of the soil is a matter of lament and criticism among their younger leaders and among their critics also in the non-Christian world.

Yet they, and the world-wide missionary movement with which they are bound up, have some precious gifts to bring. In the first place, it is only as we look at the full sweep of the missionary movement of our time and take into account the churches that have grown up all over the world, that we understand at all what is meant by the word "ecumenical." To the readers of *RELIGION IN LIFE* it is not necessary to explain that the choice of this word "ecumenical"—soon, it is hoped, to be as blessed as that other word Mesopotamia—rather than "international" was not casual but calculated. "International" suggests the givenness of the nation as the primary fact; a unity that is international is, in strictness, a unity made up out of separated national units. The word "ecumenical" goes back to the conception of the "oikoumene," the inhabited world, and an ecumenical Church was one that covered the inhabited world. (Even so it does not really contain the deeper Christian thought of the unity neither international nor widely human but constituted by the love of God in Christ.) But is it at all recognized how the claim of the Church, in the widest sense of that word, to be ecumenical would be wholly grotesque without the contribution made, particularly during the last century, by the missionary movement? The inhabited world of our day is not Europe and America. The worlds of commerce and industry, of politics, of military and naval strategy, or of art and literature are far wider. Yet it is in the main within the last hundred years or so that Christianity, and especially Protestant Christianity, has been effectively planted in the great lands of Asia and Africa which play so large a part in the modern world economy. It is not necessary to elaborate this point as it has been so thoroughly demonstrated by Professor K. S. Latourette in many of his recent

writings. A Christianity that had no roots in India, China or Japan, that was scarcely to be found in Africa, and that knew nothing at first hand of the tug and interplay of forces in the countries of the Near East would have little claim to call itself ecumenical in this our modern world. Yet it is the plain fact that the growth of churches in these lands that now number their members, taken as a whole, by the million, is due under God to the missionary enterprise of the Church, carried on as it has been with the support of never more than a moiety of the membership of the Churches in the West. How many Anglo-Saxon Christians are aware that there are in the Netherlands Indies a million and a half of Protestant Christians, and that in some portions of that archipelago, destined it may be to play a great part in the evangelization of the world, there are Christian *blocs* that comprise eighty per cent of the entire population?

It is worth adding to this that the participation of the ancient Churches of the East in the ecumenical movement has been in certain respects decisively aided by the missionary movement. But for that, is it likely that any part could have been taken in the wider fellowship of world Christianity by such a body as the Syrian Church of Malabar in India, that counts Saint Thomas the Apostle to have been its founder? The Orthodox Church in the countries of Eastern Europe has played its own distinctive part in the recent conferences, but if those ancient bodies of Christians in Palestine and Syria and Egypt are to come into the wider fellowship it will be through their contact with the missionary movement.

But this is only another way of saying that the world-wide missionary movement and the younger Churches bound up with it are set upon the goal of world-wide evangelization. If there were no more to say than this it would be more than enough. I would make bold to assert that unless the ecumenical movement is harnessed to the task of the winning of the world for Christ and making the Gospel known in all the world, it will decline into an academic affair. In one of the articles contributed to the London *Times*, before the Oxford Conference, by Professor Ernest Barker of the University of Cambridge, the point was made that beneath the whole growth of the ecumenical movement had lain what Professor Barker called the "rock" of the international missionary movement. It is in the life of the missionary movement that the whole Church finds her evangelistic purpose and obligation most clearly acknowledged. This is no mere department of the Church's life, to be remembered by some and forgotten by others. It is

as the whole life of the Church is pointed toward this great goal, and it strives continually toward it, that light is vouchsafed to it on the many problems that perplex its thought. Not by accident, but because the two thoughts are bound up together, the Fourth Gospel follows "that they may all be one" with "that the world may know that thou hast sent me."

It was a remarkable and memorable fact that at the Oxford Conference it was some of the most distinguished lay members who most simply and strongly emphasized this primary task of evangelization. I recall how Viscount Cecil at the beginning of a memorable speech in the section with which I was connected insisted that if we were thinking of the Church's work in regard to the international order the first thing to be recognized was the duty of preaching the gospel, in the hope and prayer that the lives of men might be changed and they become able to apprehend the truth of the Christian view of the world. I have heard it remarked in international Christian gatherings more than once that the passion for evangelism has passed to the devotees of the new pagan gods. People who talk like that are thinking solely in terms of Western Christianity. (I do not discuss whether the statement is true within that sphere or not.) One of the great benefits which the life of the younger Churches and the missionary movement can confer upon Western Christian life is just to bring it into touch not merely with evangelization as an ideal to be accepted but with the work of witness-bearing as something that is going on all the time, in fair and in foul weather.

But if the younger Churches remind the ecumenical movement of how far-flung the Christian Church really is, and if they can help to hold us up to the great objective of world evangelization, there is something else that they can do. The problems that tax the thought of Christian people in these ecumenical gatherings are shared by them also. The context and the details are different but they are the same problems, and it is often possible to see more clearly the nature of the Christian task in our Western countries if we see it also under the forms that it wears in the East or in Africa.

Let me describe a few of such questions. They may be looked at either as "Oxford-cum-Edinburgh" questions translated into terms of the Eastern and African world, or as excerpts from the program of the forthcoming meeting of the International Missionary Council in the East. Consider first the most vital subject of all, the Faith itself. The Christian apologist in such a country as India has a task as difficult as the world can present. My friend, Dr. S. K. Datta, the Principal of the Forman Christian College, Lahore, has

over and over again insisted that we must remember the great fact of Vedantic Hinduism, the background of all Hindu life. This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the radical challenge offered to Christianity by the Vedanta; it must suffice to say that it constitutes a body of thought which with all its majesty and beauty rests upon ideas with which the Christian gospel can hardly be reconciled. Its doctrine of God, of man, of history, of sin and redemption is not the same as the Christian only viewed from a different angle; it is radically different. Nowhere does the distinctive nature of the Biblical doctrine stand out so clearly as when we look at the Vedanta with its timeless undifferentiated unity of Brahman. The Christian preacher in so far as he is dealing with those who have knowledge of the higher Hinduism is not expounding the truth as he finds it in Jesus to people whose minds are virgin soil; even though they know but little, even though they are to some extent secularized, the atmosphere in which their minds and souls have breathed has been that atmosphere.

I am sure that this is highly relevant even to the consideration of such characteristically modern challenges to the Faith as those with which the Oxford Conference dealt. A secularized mind is not just one sort of mind. The debris out of which the European secularized mind has been made is different from the debris that lies at the base of the secularized mind in India or China or Japan. Even when all articulate and conscious belief has faded away the atmosphere remains, the old attitudes persist. In the labor of interpreting the Christian faith in such surroundings the Christians of the younger Churches and the missionaries who aid them need all the help that the best brains of the whole Church Catholic can supply. But the debt will not be one-sided. I can only say for myself that I can never be grateful enough that I have been compelled, if only in an amateurish way, to think about these things, for it becomes impossible to distinguish in one's mind the elements of Christian conviction that came from seeing Christianity in conflict with these ancient traditions from the rest of one's Christian thinking. The missionary struggle illuminates the Bible. To think what is meant by the Holy Spirit *vis-a-vis* Islam, or by the kingdom of God in the face of Hinduism, is to see things with a sudden clearness.

Take the immense subject of evangelization. We are faced by some most taxing problems here. I am not thinking of such technical matters as the payment of unordained evangelists on which mission boards have to do much thinking. Consider rather such issues as are presented by the "mass-

movements," that is, the group or community movements, in India. As Professor Latourette has pointed out, it is not a new and dangerous innovation in Christian history that groups should approach the Church as groups; it was the unbroken practice of the earlier centuries and it is virtually in the nineteenth century that the fervid conviction of the Evangelical revival made individual conversion, without reference to the group, seem the normal thing. But the group approach, as it is in parts of India today, lays upon the Church not only the burden of finding teachers and pastors in numbers adequate to what may become an incoming flood, but offers the deeper problem still, how a Church can become by the growth of the Christian life within it, an evangelistic agency itself. There are regions of the world today, and not only in India, where the harvest to be reaped is so great that no agency can possibly suffice except the Church itself, that is, the witness-bearing in life and word of the mass of Christians. It is to this that much of the best Christian effort in the mission-field is being devoted. Is it not relevant to our home Churches? If the Bishop of Dornakal regrets that only a little more than half of the communicant members of the church in his diocese took part in a special period of evangelistic effort—losing wages or the equivalent as they did so—one wonders whether in the creation of a witness-bearing Church he and his colleagues may not have something to teach.

One of the major themes of the Oxford Conference was that of Education and the relation of the Church to it. It is perhaps here that the conditions of the Eastern countries and of Africa throw most light. An immense amount of missionary labor has gone into the many branches of education in the mission field, from the village school up to the university. Often there was no other education. Even today in Africa the proportion of Christian education to the whole is enormous; in India not long ago the Christian bodies undertook about a quarter of all the higher education. But now in most countries things have changed. Not only—and of course this is to be heartily welcomed—do both governments and private generosity enter the field with far greater resources than missions can command, but there is a widespread acceptance of the aim of education as being more than the giving of instruction. For this again we must be grateful, for is it not the Christian educators who have been insisting that education has to do with the whole personality, with the development of character and not only with the provision of technical instruction? But when this view of education is accepted—and to no one is its acceptance more due than to the great centers of educa-

tional science in North America—the question instantly becomes a very urgent one—"In the light of what philosophy of life do you propose to educate the young?" I have long been convinced that even in countries where the "totalitarian State" is not yet present in any articulated form, the significance of public mass education has often been grasped by the governing mind, and that the use of that great machine to build up the sort of citizenry that is desired is well understood.

So it is not to be wondered at that the place of Christian education in Eastern countries is beset by many difficulties. Throughout the Near East, in Japan, Korea and Manchuria, in China and elsewhere it becomes a question whether Christian education will be allowed to persist in full freedom. At least it is clear that only very good quality of work has the chance to survive. It may be that the tendency in the entire modern world for the State to assume some of the characteristics of a Church and to seek to mold character in the light of revelation (a revelation in Blood and Race, or in National History and Culture, and the like) may cease, but as things now stand we have a growing tension between the Christian school and the governmental system which, because it deals in ultimates, is unwilling to give freedom within itself to those who acknowledge another Ultimate.

This brings us to the great question of Church and State. I have no kind of doubt that in many countries of our modern world much gratitude will be felt for the study made in the Oxford Conference in regard to this burning question. We think of Germany as the classical instance of the struggle for spiritual freedom in our day. I am not at all sure that the fundamental issues are not as clearly exhibited in the Far East. It was the glimpse I was able to get of a Church in Manchuria under the fire of the totalitarian State that showed me most clearly those two fundamental things about a church: that it is in the final analysis a society that must obey God, and that it is essentially ecumenical, even in its smallest parts, and is therefore a constant obstacle and reproach to those who would regiment the life of a nation around the absolute primacy of nation or State. Any Christian Church must by its very nature point continually to a wider human unity given to men by the grace of God.

Here we touch what is perhaps for us all, in East and West alike, our deepest problem, namely, the realization in life and act of the real Church. It is a highly important fact that in all these great ecumenical gatherings, so largely Protestant in their *provenance*, such concentration of attention should

be given to the Church. It was not always so. Perhaps it shows that just as the extravagances of Fascism and Nazism and Communism show man's search for community, so within the Christian folds there is arising a new sense of longing for the Church of the New Testament, the earnest of the Kingdom, the company in which the Spirit dwells. The obstacles to the realization of that vision are the same in the East as in the West. There too a Church becomes easily an intra-mundane community, dedicated to human causes; there too it slips into being a society for doing things—quite good things—and loses its core of worship and wonder. These problems, like their Western brethren, the Eastern Christians face, but in addition they have to overcome the foreignness of Churches whose origins, under God, were in the West and which have yet to strike roots deep down into the life of the peoples. It is the central paradox of a true Church that its life is divine and not human, while yet it has no life at all unless it is deeply rooted in the common living of the people of every land.

Hence it is wholly necessary and indeed urgent that the ecumenical movement should take the missionary cause and the younger Churches *au grand sérieux*. The sequence of Oxford and Edinburgh was to have been completed by a great meeting in Hangchow. The horrors of war have made that impossible, and it has been decided to hold the world meeting of the International Missionary Council in India at the end of 1938. But it will still be a world meeting, with delegates from the Far East present, and it will face after long preparation the great themes of the Faith, of Witness to that Faith, of the Church's Life, of the Church in its relationship to its environment, and of the vast need for unity and co-operation, felt in the younger Churches far more keenly than anywhere in the West. Into its thought will be poured much of the riches of Oxford and Edinburgh, but its meetings will be fraught with the keen sense of its own vast problems, and those who assemble will know that they are met to hear the Word of the Lord in what is a Day of the Lord. I end this paper with the keenest possible desire that it may at least lead some to enter into a prayerful understanding of the poignant meaning of the ecumenical Christian movement for the whole world, and to intercession on behalf of those who will come together in India out of the weakness of their Churches but in the expectancy of the power of God.

Let the Church Be the Church

HENRY SLOANE COFFIN

IT was in July in the year of our Lord 1054 that the Christian Church broke at what is called "the Great Schism" into two hostile camps—the Church of the East and the Church of the West. There had been serious differences in doctrine and custom between the two sections of Christendom for a long time, and there had been ruptures, which, however, had not proved final. A new Patriarch of Constantinople, Michael Celularius, had attempted in a conciliatory spirit to face the difficulties and repair the breach. But to his message the then Bishop of Rome, Pope Leo IX, replied savagely that he would not only "seethe the kid in its mother's milk," but would also "scrub its mangey hide with biting vinegar and salt." On the 16th of July, 1054, the papal legates placed on the altar of the Church of Hagia Sophia an anathema, cursing all who held with the leaders of the Eastern Church, and classing them "with the devil and his angels."

Last July, 883 years later, one could not help recalling that bitter incident when representatives of all the non-Roman churches, East and West, and churches from parts of the world unknown in 1054, gathered together in the University town of Oxford and owned themselves one in the unity of the one Body of Christ. The phrase perhaps oftenest heard in that ecumenical assembly was that which stands at the head of this article: "Let the Church be the Church." One thought of the verbs in a familiar description of the Church in the First Epistle of Saint Peter: "Ye *are* . . . that ye may show forth." The Church must first be her God-intended distinctive self before she can fulfill His purpose for her.

A familiar proverb runs: "God tempers the East wind to the shorn lamb." But does He? Expose a shorn lamb to its piercing blast and what happens? God prepares the lamb for its exposure to wind and weather by providing it with wool. God does not temper the stormy winds of a menacing day to a Church shorn of its divine provision for its life and work. Let the Church be the Church God designed, if she is to survive and to conquer in a gale-swept world.

In the mosaic of Old Testament metaphors which the New Testament writer, whose epistle has been referred to (1 Peter 2. 9, 10), employs to

describe the Church—a race, a priestly class, a nation, a people—group solidarity is stressed. Races, professional classes, nations are aware of their unity. The Church is to realize herself a single community.

Our post-war world has felt itself disintegrating. Nations have been breaking up in hostile factions. There have been racial clashes, economic strifes, political conflicts between men with differing ideologies. It was inevitable that the public-spirited should be preoccupied with measures to re-establish national unity. This explains totalitarianism—the effort to produce a people at one in race, in mind, in faith, in life. This accounts for the cry for “a planned economy”—the pooling of a nation’s resources under a single control to employ the labor and meet the needs of all its citizens. But these attempts have led to other conflicts. They have intensified nationalism—the most divisive factor in the modern world—and have aligned peoples against one another. They have erected into dogmas antagonistic theories of the State—Fascist, Communist, Democratic—and they have bred civil war. The outcome has been an appalling suppression of liberty, a retrogression in education and in public thinking into dark barbarism, and the reduction of thousands of human beings into robots.

None the less these movements aim at what the world needs—solidarity. But the unity which they seek is not sufficiently inclusive nor is it on a sufficiently lofty spiritual level. To protests on the bombing of civilian populations in Chinese cities, the spokesman for the Japanese foreign office is reported to have said that the moral standards of the Occident are not applicable in the Orient. If it be admitted that there is an “East of Suez” “where there ain’t no Ten Commandments,” what basis can there be for any international law? The Christian Church is the custodian of a world religion and her task is the bringing together of the entire human race in one fellowship of faith and love in the God and Father of her Lord Jesus Christ.

The Church is a comprehensive community, embracing folk of all races and nations and of every social status. Her every congregation must attempt to include all Christian elements in the surrounding population, and to keep them aware of their fellowship with the world-wide Christian fellowship. This is part of what is involved in “being the Church.”

Nationalistic churches—outstandingly American, or Scotch, or German, or Scandinavian—are undesirable. Christians belong to their respective nations, and bring the qualities of their national heritage into the Church. There is a sense in which the Church within each nation must try to be the

national soul and conscience. There is a Christian patriotism. But the fact that since the Reformation the churches affected by that movement have all been organized along national lines, has tended to obscure the more inclusive Catholic Church of which they are only parts. Few of their members are conscious of possessing more in common with Christians of other nations than with fellow-countrymen who do not share the riches of Christ. The flag of the nation certainly ought not to be displayed as a symbol inside a church edifice unless it is carefully subordinated to some symbol of the universal Christian Church. Lessons in patriotism on national festivals ought to be supplemented with lessons in fidelity to the world-wide Body of Christ. To subordinate the sense of belonging to one's own country to the sense of belonging to the universal Church is a major task in all our Christian education.

Racial churches, however expedient and inevitable they may seem for the time being, are not desirable. In the early Church it was a racial barrier which was attacked and broken down, when Saint Paul insisted that Christ did away with "the middle wall of partition" which sundered Jew and Gentile. There is no place for a color line, nor for anti-Semitism, nor for any similar discrimination, in the company of followers of Christ. The Church in her congregations and her institutions must show herself beyond racial distinctions. This may not be achieved overnight. It is patent that to carry it out in many communities abruptly would cause most bitter conflicts and might work more harm than good. But beginnings must be attempted. Exchanges of pulpit between white and negro ministers, joint services where Christians of both races unite, gatherings of students where negro and white youth face common problems as disciples of the one Lord, ministerial associations where the accredited leaders of the Churches share their scholarly resources and face their professional tasks together, and have fellowship in worship and in the enrichment of their lives in God—these are the least which should be at once undertaken as evidences that the Church is seriously trying "to be the Church." Communism makes an appeal to the intellectuals in races which suffer from discrimination because it claims to transcend racial barriers. These realistic thinkers cannot be held, so long as the Church's supraracial character remains a mere matter of talk. There must be in every community concrete embodiments which evidence that the middle wall of partition is done away in Christ.

Class churches are even less sufferable. The most superficial student of

an American community notices that persons of one economic and social set find themselves at home in one congregation and those of a different status at home in another. The two congregations may belong to the same denomination; or, if they belong to separate denominations, the real difference is not mainly in creed or church government or form of worship, but in the distinction of the social sets. Trace the rise in wealth of almost any American family and the changes in denominational affiliation which go along with them. Look at communities where city dwellers spend their summers, and proceed to establish a summer church, not because their beliefs differ so much from the all-year-round residents, but because they prefer to worship with their own set and in the patterns which are congenial to the tastes of that set. In industrial communities, how rarely operatives and managers and owners find fellowship in one congregation. Since the serious rifts of our time are economic rather than doctrinal or ritual, it would be far more statesmanlike for Christian leaders to compromise on theological differences and ceremonial divergences and bring Christians of varying economic status and social outlook into weekly comradeship in the house of God. A class stratified Church cannot unify an industrially warring mankind. Confronted with the peril of class conflict the Church must be the Church.

In the mosaic of metaphors in Saint Peter's description of the Church, the adjectives—an *elect* race, a *royal* priesthood, a *holy* nation, God's *own* ("peculiar" in the Authorized Version is derived from the Latin "*peculium*")—bring out the thought that the Church is not a voluntary and man-made organization, like a club or some similar association of persons who band themselves together. It is a company of God's selection and calling, an organism formed and vitalized by His Spirit.

In the Message which the Oxford Conference sent out to the Churches is this paragraph:

"The unity of this fellowship is not built up from its constituent parts, like a federation of different states. It consists of the sovereignty and redeeming acts of its Lord. The source of unity is not the consenting movement of men's wills; it is Jesus Christ whose one life flows through the Body and subdues the many wills to His."

It is a frequent practice to lump the various public institutions in a community—schools, settlements, hospitals, fraternal organizations, *churches*. In one sense churches are social institutions, supplying their communities with inspiration, ideals, education, friendship. But a church is never just one

among other social institutions. It is a unique company of ordinary persons, older and younger, chosen and called of God to share His life in Christ. As institutions churches exist primarily to witness to God, to evidence in life and work and message His gospel in Christ, and to worship Him with the homage of the thought, affection, and possessions of all their members. Every church is *the Church* in miniature. Let the Church be the Church—this singular God-created and God-sustained and God-owned community.

In recent decades we have indulged in the sociological interpretation of the Church. We speak of churches as human institutions which we join and support, as we do other desirable and useful organizations. We measure their worth in terms of social utility—the number and variety of services which they render their neighborhoods. When congregations appeal to their communities for funds to erect a new edifice or to supplement their incomes it is a common practice to say nothing of their religious witness and to emphasize the ministries of human helpfulness which they perform. The average American has come to think that a church is “a good thing” for his town, but never to think of what it means to Almighty God. It is the human, not the divine, aspect of the Church which her own leaders have placed before the public mind.

What we men make of the Church is certainly important. But before we have anything whatsoever to do with her the Church is here—God’s gift, not our achievement. He founded the Church through the coming, the teaching, the death, the resurrection and the continuing presence of His Son. He maintains and empowers her from age to age by His Spirit in the lives of followers of Christ. The Church is God’s creation, not man’s. We may deface and ruin her. Men have nearly wrecked her again and again. She survives our ignorance and selfishness and folly and pride by God’s faithfulness, who keeps His covenant with His people despite all. We can increase and adorn the Church only by letting God work in and through us, that the Church may be His, not our, building. When we cease to think of the Church, and of her smallest congregation, as a divine institution, we denature her. “Ye are an *elect* race, a *royal* priesthood, a *holy* nation, a people for *God’s own* possession that ye may. . . .” Let the Church be the Church.

The nouns in the apostle’s description are a significant amplification of the phrase on the lips of the Oxford delegates.

A *race*. Christians are a distinctive breed of men. Early Christian writers used to speak of them as a third genus along with Jews and Gentiles.

Their life is born from above and they derive it through Christ. They are a new species of humanity. They are a stock—a stock which generation after generation comes true to the faith and hope and love of Christ. Their heredity is not merely an historic ancestry reaching back across the centuries to Jesus Christ—important as that historic succession of His Spirit is. Their heredity is contemporary—they take their lives, their minds, their purposes, their sympathies, their energies, anew day after day from God through Christ. Their ancestry is a present association, a life-giving companionship. They trace their descent not only through the generations of devoted and believing parents, teachers, pastors, missionaries, martyrs, who have transmitted from age to age the Spirit of Christ; they renew that descent for themselves by bringing their every thought into obedience to Christ, that His mind may control them. The Church is the unique breed of human beings whose life derives from and is daily supplied by the Spirit of God.

A priesthood. A priest's main function is to present for others an offering to God. That conception frankly is meaningless to the average American Protestant. If he is to give anything to others, why not do it directly? How can one offer to God who needs nothing? But according to Jesus He needs men, and men do most for their fellows by presenting themselves to God. From that scene in the Temple at twelve when He gave Himself to His Father's business until the final cry from the Cross, Jesus offered Himself to do and to endure His Father's will for His brethren's sake.

Among contemporary Protestants it is customary to view even the public worship of God from its manward side—what do the worshipers derive from it? If the worshiper feels that the service helps him, he attends; if not, he remains away. It does not apparently occur to him that he is one of a company of priests presenting a corporate offering to God. But through prayer, praise, sermon, sacrament, worship is the presentation of thought and loyalty and resolve to God that He may be the richer and the abler to manifest Himself in His and our world. What occurs in a service of public worship is symbolic of the Church's entire life. Christians are a priestly caste. By presenting our minds to God, we lift public opinion by that degree and align it with His thought; by bringing our sympathies to accord with His, we give His heart more scope to touch and heal the lonelinesses and wounds of men; by bringing our consciences to the cross of Christ and yielding them to Him, they receive the obligations which He felt and feels, and through such consciences the moral climate of the world is changed. As

priests we offer our homes, our friendships, our business, our city, our country, our world to God. No one can estimate the divine results which ensue from such linking of human relations to Him.

A nation. This also is a term foreign to contemporary Christian thinking in regard to the Church. A nation is a community bound together by common experiences and interests out of which grow its customs and ways and distinctive characteristics. Christians share the experience of the redeeming love of God in Christ. We are mastered by the absorbing interest of getting His will done in every realm of life. We possess the heritage of His Word in the Bible, of the memories of saints of many centuries, of the recollection of God's providence directing and of His presence active in Christian history from the prophets and Christ down to our time. We are united in such customs as prayer, praise, the Sabbath, the sacraments. When Christians of widely diverging traditions and views come together, as in the conferences of this past summer, it is amazing how vastly much we have in common. Our modes of worship vary (one thinks of a Greek Orthodox Vespers and of the group for prayer led by Professor Emil Brunner at Oxford), but manifestly we are communing with the one God revealed in Christ, and, whatever our ritual tradition or preference, we can heartily share in the differing services. Our statements of belief conflict at certain points and differ in emphasis throughout; but the underlying convictions of God, of Christ, of the guiding, empowering, hallowing Spirit, of redemption from sin, of the Church, of life eternal, are one. Our methods of work are dissimilar—and wisely so; but our purpose, which is not ours, but God's, is identical—to establish His reign over all and every life. In the face of conflicting human nationalisms tearing mankind in war, we assert our divine nationality in the Church. We are subjects of God's eternal kingdom; we are "a colony of heaven"; we are fellow-citizens with the saints of all the centuries, governed by the one law of Christ's love, and committed to the one policy of conquering the world by that love for Him.

"A people for God's own possession." When the small group of those who had been chosen to lead the Oxford Conference convened for a preliminary meeting to perfect plans and decide on methods of procedure, it seemed to us problematical whether out of that miscellaneous assembly, representing such a variety of communions, a message to the churches could be arrived at in which all would heartily agree. Reports, which recorded divergences as well as agreements, appeared all we dared expect. It was decided that it

was unwise to plan for the preparation of such a message. But as the days spent together in discussion and worship wore by, it became apparent that a surprising accord existed on all the themes before us, despite differences, and that this representative company of earnest leaders of the Church would be sorely disappointed were no chance afforded to utter our common mind in an appeal to the Christian world. A message was drafted by the Archbishop of York, and revised, and then recast and revised several times again, until it commanded the assent of those leading the sections and presiding over the Conference. It was phrased in the three languages of the Conference, German, French and English, and on the final afternoon of our public sessions it was read in German by Professor Brunner, its adoption was moved by Dr. John R. Mott and he was seconded by the Archbishop of Thyatira and various other leaders. The presiding chairman of that session, Doctor Eidem, the Lutheran Archbishop of Upsala, put the question. It seemed that every delegate rose, but one could not be sure. Then he called for the negatives, and when not one person stood, there was a dramatic moment when everyone's feelings were profoundly affected.

While the vote was being moved, Doctor Eidem had quietly collected three New Testaments, and in the amazed moment which succeeded on the recognition that no negative vote was to be recorded, he began reading, first in German, then in French, finally in English:

"After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. And all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders and the four beasts, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshiped God, saying, Amen; Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God forever and ever. Amen."

Out of the Scriptures, the cherished heritage of that whole company, he had chosen with supreme skill the appropriate passage which expressed the dedication in adoring worship of the universal Church to God, known and loved in the Lamb slain. The final word about the Church is not of anything which we her members can do or which we possess. It is that we belong to Him who sitteth on the throne of the universe, and stand at His beck and bidding, and are set to follow the Lamb whithersoever He would lead us. We are a people for God's own possession to show forth the excellencies of Him who called us out of darkness into His marvelous light.

The Function of the Church-Related College in Our System of Education

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD

THERE was recently published a careful survey of the class of 1911 of Harvard University, made by one of the prominent members of the class twenty-five years after graduation. The survey claims to be a good cross-section view of the social success of American college men after twenty-five years of experience in their world. Of the total class of 1911 at Harvard, 14 per cent who are still living did not reply to the questions sent them; 541 replied. It seems probable that on account of the 14 per cent who did not reply, the picture drawn of this Harvard class twenty-five years after graduation is not exaggerated. One of the most striking results of the survey was that over 50 per cent of the class expressed disappointment with their lifework. The grounds for disappointment ranged all the way from total dependency to simple dislike of one's occupation. No less than 10 per cent of the class, possibly more, had been on relief, public or private, during the recent depression, and this in spite of the fact that 47 per cent of the married members of the class reported that their wives were actively engaged in work outside of the home to increase the family income. Over half of the class had entered commercial callings, but 38 per cent had entered public service professions. Only 2 per cent, however, had entered the ministry, although in its early history, 50 per cent of all Harvard graduates had entered that calling. The average income of the 541 Harvard men of the class of 1911 who answered inquiries appears to have been about \$4,450 a year. But this relatively high average was in part due to the fact that some extremely successful members of the class had incomes of above \$50,000 a year. These men, however, had come mostly from families of wealth or of financial and business prestige. Some members of the class reported that their annual income was as low as \$200 a year.

Turning now to the more spiritual side of the life history of these Harvard men, we find that only 27 per cent reported that they were regular churchgoers, although it is estimated that as high as 42 per cent of the general population are regular churchgoers. Only 13 per cent reported that

they had taken any part in civic or political life, even though 38 per cent were reported to have entered public service professions. The graduates themselves report that they had found little of practical value in most of their college courses. Thirty per cent had found some value in their English courses, and 20 per cent some value in their courses in economics. Only 4 per cent reported that they had found value in their courses in Government, although Abbott Lawrence Lowell was their instructor. Still smaller per cents found value in other courses in the curriculum. One goes so far as to say, "No one course was of any worth to me;" and the writer of the survey, himself a member of the class, Mr. John R. Tunis, says in effect, we were badly educated in the fundamental problems of society and the State, and few of us have taken any trouble to make up our deficiencies in this line.

However, it is probable that the trouble with this Harvard education of 1911 goes deeper than any deficiencies in social science courses; for one member of the class remarks, "I've traveled all over the world, in this country, and in Europe, and have yet to find out what life is all about." If this Harvard man represented his class, he was surely pointing out a most glaring deficiency in Harvard education.

This survey of the life history of Harvard graduates seems to have been made with considerable care and to have been conducted dispassionately. There seems to be some good reason, too, to believe that it does represent a cross-section of the life history of American college men; for similar surveys made of Yale and Princeton graduates seem to yield somewhat similar results. Moreover, I would say that my impression is that not very dissimilar results would be found if a survey were made of the life histories of my 423 classmates in the class in which I graduated at Cornell University. It may be, of course, that more favorable results would be exhibited by surveys of the life histories of graduates of church-related colleges; for these institutions are smaller, more attention is probably given to the problems of individual students, and especially more attention to their spiritual welfare.

Nevertheless, I submit that facts like these should cause all of us who are students or teachers in colleges to raise questions concerning the type of education which is imparted in our colleges and universities. It may be said that such surveys are superficial and fail to show the deeper successes and failures in the life of college graduates. That must be admitted; but it may be added that these external successes or failures which are studied by such survey methods are usually indicative of deeper spiritual conditions. We

cannot therefore brush aside the challenge which such studies bring to us, even though they are superficial.

Moreover, the results indicated by these surveys have for some time been more or less dimly sensed by college teachers and executives. Within the last few days we find President Angell, who has retired from the headship of Yale University, saying publicly that to prevent collective suicide, or collective murder and the complete destruction of our civilization by war, we must change our education. He says that we must look to philosophy and to fundamental science for more complete guidance in human living, and that therefore, these should receive more attention in our education. If he had said that we must look more to a philosophy of *life* and to fundamental *social* science, I should agree with him. Again, President Conant of Harvard expresses concern because 36 per cent of this year's freshmen at Harvard indicate a preference in their elections for such social sciences as History, Economics, Government and Sociology. Whether it is true or not that such an overwhelming trend toward the social sciences at Harvard may upset the intellectual balance, as President Conant is said to fear, it would seem to indicate that the students themselves are beginning to sense what has been wrong with our education, and are, in their groping way, trying to correct the error. But probably deeper analysis of the problem needs to be made, and more careful guidance needs to be given to students than is afforded by their sense of the world's needs.

It seems to me that the 1911 Harvard graduate who said, "I've traveled all over the world and have yet to find out what life is all about," more nearly put his finger upon what was wrong with Harvard education, and upon what is still wrong with a great deal of college education. You will remember that the Harvard Class of 1911 produced few spiritual leaders. I mean by spiritual leaders, persons who know their human world, its desperate needs, its present desperate maladies, and who have something more to propose than further material achievements to meet the situation. Now, I believe that the only reason for the existence of the church-related college is that its function is to train such spiritual leaders. The training of such leaders, unlike the training of leaders in the physical sciences, in engineering, in medicine, and in business, requires no costly equipment; for the spiritual leader does not work with physical tools and physical goods, but with the minds of men. This field of training social and spiritual leaders is therefore open to the college with moderate or even meager equipment on

an equal footing with the great universities. The colleges have been accused of wanting to be universities. The doggerel rhyme is well known:

"Hush, little college, don't you cry,
You'll be a university bye and bye."

The church-related college should not aspire to be a university. It can become something better than our great universities. It can become a center for the training of youth in humanistic and social studies in such a way that they will be equipped for the spiritual leadership of mankind. And whether we like it or not, every thoughtful person must acknowledge that our world is perishing for lack of spiritual leadership. We saw a moment ago that Harvard sent over 50 per cent of its graduates into commercial callings. It is a commonplace among those of us who have watched university graduates go forth into life, that the best brains among these graduates have gone into the physical sciences, into materialistic arts, into business and finance, and left too often the mediocre to enter such callings as the ministry, teaching, journalism and social statesmanship, because these social service professions have little to offer in the way of financial remuneration.

Naturally the church-related college has been swept along with the current of our increasingly dominating material and commercial life. The demand has been placed upon them, both by students and parents, to furnish instruction in material and commercial subjects, until sometimes their curricula are scarcely to be distinguished from those of the undergraduate schools of the great universities. Departments of commerce and business, of physical science and engineering, flourish in them sometimes almost as much as in the universities. Endowments are not only accepted but frequently sought for these materialistic studies. The excuse is made that the church-related college can train leaders in materialistic lines who will have a spiritual outlook, and that thus God and humanity can be served quite as much as though they had trained spiritual leaders for mankind. However, when we see so much of the best brains of the country going into these materialistic callings, we must doubt if this excuse is valid. I am not proposing that the church-related college shall turn out graduates with a poor intellectual balance, who do not appreciate the importance of the physical sciences and materialistic achievements in our civilization. I am only proposing that the church-related college shall try to restore the intellectual balance which actually has been disturbed, in the way of the commercialization and material-

ization of our life, by the great universities. In spite of the trend on the part of students at Harvard to elect humanistic and social studies, I still despair of the larger universities correcting their over-emphasis upon material achievement. They have mortgaged so much of their resources to this side of education that they have virtually sold out our civilization to material interests.

That this charge is well-based may be seen from the statement by Dr. Raymond Fosdick, President of the Rockefeller Foundation, in his last report. "It has been estimated," he says, "that of all the money spent on research in Great Britain and the United States, one-half of the total goes for industrial research and for the underlying pure research in physics and chemistry. Of the remaining half, 50 per cent is spent on research in connection with military questions. Of the remaining quarter of the total sum, the larger part is devoted to research in agriculture and the branches of biology which support it. Further down the list is research in medicine and health. Finally come the social sciences with an infinitesimal fraction of the total devoted to their development. For research in the humanities the amount is relatively so small as to be scarcely discernible."

My thesis is that it is idle to think that the church-related college can compete with the great university in preparing students for materialistic achievements; that indeed, this is not its function, and that it would be a calamity to our civilization if it attempted to do so. Put positively, my thesis is that the function of the church-related college is to train spiritual leaders, and that the main element in that training is knowledge of conditions in our human world; as I said a moment ago, of its desperate needs and its present desperate maladies. I do not believe that the teaching of traditional religion is the main element needed in the training of such spiritual leaders. Not only does traditional religious instruction have very little effect upon our modern college students, but it is no longer adequate to meet the complex problems which confront our human world. Religion cannot work successfully for the redemption of our human world without knowledge of the forces which make and mar the lives of men. That these forces are social no longer admits of any doubt. Both intensive and extensive knowledge of our civilization, of its present condition and character, and especially of the elements in it which so often produce confusion and personal disintegration, is necessary for the training of religious leaders and of all other kinds of spiritual leaders. Systematic knowledge of the condition, needs, and possibilities of man is to be found only in those bodies of knowledge which we

term the social studies or the social sciences. Therefore, I believe that the church-related college, instead of trying to compete with the great university, should devote practically all of its energies to making itself a center for training in these studies.

It is often objected that no subjects have proved more upsetting to college students than these humanistic and social studies. This is certainly true, as they have been taught in some institutions. If they are rightly taught, no studies can be made more inspiring. It is surely the great function of the church-related college to teach these subjects in such a way as to train and inspire a spiritual leadership which shall be the equal of any that human history has produced. To do this, I need hardly say that the church-related college must keep the higher human values uppermost in the teaching of the social studies. This is difficult in view of the demand which has gone up from the leaders in the pure sciences, especially in the natural sciences, that all scientific teaching should be divorced from questions of value. It is surely a mistake, however, to divorce education in any of its aspects from questions of value; for *education is essentially a process of discovering the values of life*. If these values are so ordered as to place the higher and more spiritual values first, then education becomes essentially religious, it seems to me; and this is surely the sort of education which the church-related college should strive to give to its students.

That there are more difficulties and dangers in a socialized spiritual education, than in any other sort of education, must be admitted. In the first place, it must be conceded that this sort of education is new even in idea; and so far as I know, in no institution has it as yet been completely and satisfactorily worked out. Let me describe to you some of the things which seem to me involved in such a socialized spiritual education.

First of all let us remember that no education is worthy of the name which does not free the mind of the pupil. The ideal of the old-fashioned liberal education in this respect was sound at bottom. If the mind of the student is to be liberated from ignorance, superstition, and prejudice, then, of course, both freedom of thinking and freedom of teaching must be preserved in the college classroom. Respect for all truth as the word of God should be taught. The teacher should consider himself a servant of the truth quite as much as the minister of religion. Not only respect of the truth, but the duty of clear and careful thinking should be inculcated. Ours is an age characterized not only by superficial thinking, but I sometimes fear, by very

little thinking. To think clearly and profoundly upon the facts, experiences, and problems of human life is in itself a service to humanity and must be the very foundation of training for spiritual leadership in the modern world. All the implements, methods and knowledge necessary for such thinking are a part of a socialized education, and it need not be argued that languages and physical sciences have a large place in such education.

But knowledge of our human world, of the history of mankind, of the present condition and possibilities of men, has a still larger place. Such knowledge will do even more than the knowledge of languages and physical sciences to liberate the human mind, and to prepare the student for human service. "The proper study of mankind is man," we all say; but practically no institution of learning has had the courage to carry out this almost self-evident truth. Frequently our students are informed of almost everything except the condition of their human world, especially of its needs and possibilities. The Dean of the Graduate School of Vanderbilt University has recently said, "It is a surprising fact that it is possible for a student in some Southern institutions to go through four years of training and receive the A. B. degree without having had any instruction in American history, in either high school or college, and many students complete their college courses without having had any work in economics, political science, or sociology."

Now, knowledge of our human world, of its needs and possibilities is the very material upon which social imagination must be fed; and there is no hope of a harmonious adjustment of human relations without the development of social imagination. We are all educated just in proportion as we are able imaginatively to put ourselves in the place of any other human being, no matter whether he belongs to our class, nation, race, or age, whether he is socially near or remote from us. Perhaps this is an impossible ideal to realize; but it is worth striving for in our education, and especially in training for spiritual leadership. It should no longer be possible for any part of our population to be told that they do not know how the other half lives. It should not be possible to say, as we can now truthfully say, that nine-tenths of our people do not know even how one-tenth of their fellows live. The more fortunate and sheltered classes particularly need to know how the less fortunate classes have to live. We need to know that great numbers of human beings, even in our own country, live under conditions worse than those usually afforded to our domestic animals.

Such facts, of which there are a countless number, may stir our social imagination and even awaken our human sympathy; but they are not the vital part of a socialized spiritual education. That vital part is found in an education into appreciation of human values. The use we make of facts or of information will depend upon our values. It is entirely possible to learn all of the facts in history, economics and sociology for entirely selfish purposes. Values must be taught if we expect our students to put their knowledge of facts to good use. Factual science is, therefore, never sufficient to give a socialized education. Unless social facts or information are used to stir our motives for action, we shall fall very far short of socializing the character of our students. Social knowledge should be taught to our students because it is the indispensable basis for intelligent social service. The service ideal ought to be as much a part of a sound education as it is of sound instruction in religion. Here again, religion and education blend, and the church-related college is perhaps of all institutions best fitted to do the blending.

If it should be objected that this is a part of social philosophy rather than of scientific social knowledge, I would agree, and say that a social philosophy in the sense of a philosophy of the values which ought to be emphasized in human living together, is what should be aimed at in education. If again, it be said that we have no adequate basis as yet upon which to formulate a social philosophy, or to outline an ideal human society, then I should point out that such social philosophies are being taught to youth all over the world, whether we like it or not, whether in colleges and educational institutions or not; and that it is high time that we take this fact into account. The historian of the future will consider this as an age of social philosophy; for at least three great nations of the continent of Europe are today dominated in practically all of their policies by social philosophies. Russia is dominated by the historical materialism of Karl Marx and his disciples. Italy is guided, according to Mussolini, by the social philosophy of Vilfredo Pareto. Germany is dominated, in the main, by the racialism of Houston Stewart Chamberlain and of others who believe that race is the chief factor in human development and destiny.

The unfortunate thing is that all of these social philosophies, which are now dominating nearly 300,000,000 people on the continent of Europe, are without adequate scientific foundation. It is still more unfortunate that in all three of these countries there is not enough critical social intelligence to make any headway against these false and one-sided social philosophies. Even

the university professors of economics, political science, sociology, and history in Russia, Italy and Germany have subscribed to these social philosophies, or have acquiesced in them. Moreover, equally one-sided social philosophies threaten us. It is practically impossible for even the ordinary intelligent citizen to go without some sort of working social philosophy. The uneducated man may, of course, hold to various social philosophies, using now one, now another, as the exigencies of the situation and his own interest seem to require. If we do not train our students to bring critical intelligence to bear upon these one-sided social philosophies, they may overwhelm us as well as Europe. As some one well said, we have the alternative before us of teaching a Christian democratic philosophy of human living together, or of accepting the Communism of Karl Marx, the Racialism of Hitler, or the Fascism of Mussolini. Yet this year I found among my Graduate Students at Duke University, a young woman from a Southern college who told me that her attention had never been called to such philosophies as economic determinism, racialism, or Fascism.

Some may say that all training of critical intelligence in our students is inadequate to solve this problem. I should agree with you, and say that it is just here that the church-related college has an advantage over any other type of educational institution. For it ought to be the privilege of the teacher in the church-related college not only to point out the difference between a Christian and a pagan social philosophy, but also to inspire his students with enthusiasm for building a Christian world. Not long ago, a leading religious journal published an article from an educational specialist, demanding that the education in our schools be more "child-centered." The editor of this journal replied in an editorial, perhaps rightly, that what our education needed was to be more "God-centered." However, we remember that there has been much God-centered education in the past, in India, in Judea, in Medieval Europe, not to mention many other times and places, which has not particularly benefited man, because men have fashioned their idea of God too much in the image of their own society. Obviously, religion needed something to give a clearer definition of God, which would prevent any such perversion of the idea. We Christians find our definition of God in the life and teachings of Christ. Ours is not, strictly speaking, a God-centered religion, but a Christ-centered religion; for we find God in Christ. The church-related college can and should make its education of the young, whom it is training for spiritual leadership, Christ-centered. It

should endeavor to show in all of its courses which deal with man and human relations, that the Christ spirit, the spirit which works for the redemption of mankind, and the establishment of a kingdom of God among men, is the touchstone of all values. The church-related college, in other words, should boldly teach that Christian ideals of life are not only practicable, but that no other ideals are practicable in the long run; that our religion very fortunately furnishes us certain guiding principles in working for the redemption of mankind, which the social sciences can only confirm.

All this is equivalent to saying that the teachers in our church-related colleges need themselves a Christian philosophy of life. I am not referring to any matter of theological orthodoxy, but rather to that Christian idealism which is the source and inspiration of all effective Christian leadership. The church-related college needs more and better Christian teachers, if it is to fulfill its function of training spiritual leaders; and it especially needs such teachers in the social studies. Such teachers should not take their ideals and standards from the educational trend of the time. They may be often called upon to go against the current, because the current may be going in the wrong direction. Remember that the education of the past two generations not only sustained the World War, but produced men in plenty who defended, apologized, and promoted all the pagan tendencies in our civilization. There is undoubtedly a race between education and disaster; but the education for individual success and materialistic achievement will not save us from disaster. The only education which can save us is one which will effect a psychological revolution, and lead us all to see that men cannot live together upon the bases of selfish aggrandizement, exploitation, or violence; that men can live together only upon a basis of mutual service, mutual sacrifice, and mutual good will. The world has made the mistake in its political, economic and even domestic life, of forgetting the teachings of the great Master Teacher. Hence, our world has become one of moral confusion; but this confusion is, in my opinion, quite entirely the result of widespread acceptance of false and one-sided ideals of life. In a certain sense it is without excuse. Stalwart believers in the truth of Christian ideals should have no fear in applying all of these ideals to all phases of the life of mankind, so far as it is possible to do so. If it will stand by the teaching of the Great Master with unflinching loyalty, the church-related college may perhaps again regain its central position in our educational system.

Christian Apologetics Today

THEODORE O. WEDEL

APOLOGETICS is, as we all know, the defense of the faith against its enemies. It is Christianity on a war footing. During times of peace it has often been the Cinderella among theological disciplines. Historical scholarship and dogmatic theology have frequently boasted of far greater academic triumphs.

Our day, however, is not one for theological pacifism. War and war's alarms are upon us. The sanctuary has become a fortress. Christianity is once again, as it was in the Roman Empire, against the world. Battling for the Christian faith and the Christian Church is again a glorious adventure.

Yet for this struggle, Christianity is ill prepared. For a hundred years and more she has had to occupy herself with intramural fighting. Protestant has opposed Catholic, orthodox has opposed liberal; fundamentalist has faced the disillusionment of higher criticism; and one and all have wrestled with the avalanche of scientific thought and discovery. And now, when at least some of these older warfares seem accomplished, but while the Christian world is still torn by inherited dissensions, she faces a giant enemy outside her walls, compared with which former opponents appear but as pygmies. She faces a world which is beginning to ignore both Catholic and Protestant, orthodox or liberal, fundamentalist or modernist. She faces a secularism which offers its own gospels of salvation—gospels which do not require belief in God or in man's repentance or the necessity of a divine redemption, which ignore altar and cross and prayer, which entice the populace with utopian dreams so glamorous that even the Christian mythology of heaven pales in comparison.

And as Christianity confronts this new pagan world, and is girding herself for a great Armageddon, she must obey the law of military strategy. She must acquaint herself with the enemy.

Let us, then, look at the secularism of our time. It is a Hydra-headed monster. It takes many forms and speaks with many voices. The philosophies upon which it relies range all the way from a militant atheism to a humanitarian gospel of brotherhood which, superficially considered, can hardly be distinguished from the Christian faith.

One of the simplest ways of understanding it, in fact, is to think of it as still a Christian heresy, its prophets as heirs of the Christian tradition though denying their Christian birthright. It is a gospel desirous of achieving the fruits of religion without paying religion's price. It is a utopian idealism living on a stored-up capital, wasting its substance in sentimental emotions. It denies God, but believes in man.

For it was Christianity which once brought man out of pagan despair to a belief in himself as a child of God and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. It was Christianity which achieved the ethics of human brotherhood, of justice to the poor and downtrodden, of the dignity of labor and the joys of charity. One has merely to step back into the world of ancient Greece and Rome to see what a social revolution was wrought by the Christian faith and the Christian Church. This world no longer a meaningless victim of death and corruption. Man no longer a mere creature of an hour, victim of the thievery of time, but a being little lower than the angels. But this faith in man and in the sacramental significance of temporal creation rested upon a belief in a great divine action, a belief in a gift of God's grace, in an astounding story of salvation, the death of a Divine Being upon a cross and the payment of a tremendous price. And Christianity, so long as it was aware of this foundation of its faith, found its chief and first duty in worship of the Author of the great gift, in grateful penitence before the Cross, the symbol of what it had cost to make men worthy of dignity and compassion. All of the Christian achievements in personal and social goodness were motivated by a grateful response to a love which must at best leave man hopelessly in debt. At the center of his consciousness was what God had done, and was still willing to do for those who had entered the strait gate into the mystery of divine fellowship. Without that divine grace, man was conscious of his nothingness, of his sin, of the utter precariousness of human life.

Now divorce the belief in the dignity of man from this gospel of God's redeeming action, emancipate man from his consciousness of dependence upon grace, secularize the dream of God's kingdom so as to make of it a merely temporal Utopia, and you get the secular gospels of our time. We then get idealism without repentance, hope without fear of judgment, trust in human goodness without consciousness of original sin. We get the humanism, the faith in man and his powers to save himself, which is the common denominator in all the non-Christian gospels of our day.

And while, in our country at least, the older Christian tradition is still

tolerated or even respected, it is beginning to be ignored. Define the goal of human striving in terms of this world, of a temporal good, however ethically lofty this may be, and the rituals of a religion dealing with things unseen do begin to appear useless and a little absurd.

An analogy may serve. Time was—and not many generations since—when classical learning ruled in education. It shared with the tradition of religious culture the characteristic of being unworldly. It had no immediate utility in the marketplace. The educational disciplines based upon it produced the gentleman, the man of leisure. Yet this great tradition of European education is today scarcely known. It is not fought or hated. It is simply ignored. The world has moved too fast for it. No one minds very much if a few devotees still study Greek, and still thrill over the pages of Socrates or Plato, provided they do not halt the procession. But such culture is plainly a luxury shouldered aside by the clamoring demands of a world of things. For this demise of classical education, its prophets and priests are no doubt themselves partly to blame. They were guilty of academic pride. They pursued learning in ivory towers. They refused to humble themselves to the point of practicing apologetics. But no one can view the present educational world exactly with complacency. A precious tradition has been lost. The wisdom of the ages is locked up in libraries—at a time, too, when the insight of a Plato and an Aristotle might save the world from folly and disaster.

Like all parables, mine does not perfectly apply. But is not the Christian tradition being similarly shouldered aside? Religious illiteracy is swamping us. Learning may flourish in the theological schools. Of what good is it if even the Bible is an unread book? Modernist Christianity may be repudiating its humanist heresies and rediscovering the romance of orthodoxy—such a thing, for example, as what Chesterton calls “the good news of original sin.” But such heartening revolutions in the religious world are no longer front-page news. The world has outgrown them all.

Neither Fascist nor Communist nor idealistic reformer has time to waste. To wait for the philosophers to make peace with one another, to delay until the Christian liturgies have regained their hold upon a pagan people, to halt until men's hearts shall have been moved by prayer and inward revolutions (social though we grant they be) in the souls of men, is far too slow. Hence we turn to the quick solutions of political action. We may see such action fail, as in the prohibition experiment, but it is a failure which has

apparently not taught us much. The rule of power is upon us. We can take short cuts by way of the police, by way of social law, by way at worst of class war and dictatorship. Nor can the Christian Church altogether afford to oppose such appeals to power. Judgment is upon her, too. Like a Jeremiah, with Nebuchadnezzar at the gates of Jerusalem, she may see in the coming iron rule of commissar or storm troops, or even of an N. R. A., a just doom upon misused freedom.

Edmund Burke, a hundred and fifty years ago, voiced a warning which can give us pause even today. "Society," he says, "cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things, that men of intemperate minds cannot be free." It is quite possible, surely, that the Christian Church will have to adjust herself to a great increase in the secular power of the State—to see in the rise of social collectivism the hand of God itself. She may recall the Hebrew prophet's words: "Assyria, the rod of my anger." Speaking for myself, I can share with my radical friends some of their realistic insight into the needs of our day for new social controls. What I cannot share is their confusing this social control with the kingdom of God. It were as if a Babylonian captivity, necessary as this was for the conversion of God's people, had been confused with the rebuilding of the Temple.

But the pagan world of our day is not going to read the signs of the times in the mood of a Jeremiah or of a Burke. It sees in the new age of power, not a Babylonian captivity coming as a judgment for sin, but the hope of salvation itself. And to understand this delusion of the contemporary world, let us not underrate its attractiveness. It is indeed marvelously appealing. To confront it with the realism and other-worldly challenge of the Christian view of God and man seems at times a hopeless venture.

Take, if you will, such a phrase (part of the stock in trade of contemporary sentimentalism) as the Brotherhood of Man. It is an apparently obvious human ideal. It has been sung by poets from primitive times. Those who are still touched by the Christian tradition can find its noblest expressions in Christian literature itself. It can be extracted from the Sermon on the Mount. It looks like the gospel of charity in 1 Corinthians 13. Taken seriously, it is a gospel of revolution. It can hurl dynamite into our present industrial order.

Why not, then, take it seriously? Why not achieve it? And in

achieving it, why not emancipate it from the shackles of institutional religion, take it out of the house of prayer and from the communism of the altar rail into the marketplace? In the final analysis, is even belief in God a necessary adjunct of it? Cannot an atheist believe in justice and equality, in peace, and the poignant rights of the poor? Extract from the Christian tradition its apparently humanitarian ethics and the world is prepared to bow before it. We may use force to bring in the brotherly kingdom, yes, but this is but a necessary means to an end. Why not, then, equate the gospel of salvation with the appeal to human love?

Well, it is, in a way, a fair question. It is being asked by millions today and on the answer to it depends, quite possibly, the attitude of our time to the Christian Church.

The gospel of brotherhood, of fraternity, divorced from its Christian anchorage, is only one of the forms of sentimental secularism, but it is a crucial instance. Abolish the first and great commandment, or let it become a mere drop-curtain in the background. Why is not the second enough—a loving your neighbor as yourself? Narrow this concept of who is my neighbor to racial group or economic class, and you get an even more powerful gospel, since it can ally itself to a corresponding hate and can thus bring not peace but a sword. Remove God from the cosmos and man takes on, apparently at least, a meaning greater than he had in the Christian view. Man now is alone in a universe without a roof. There are no loving arms in a realm above the clouds. But have we not each other? We achieve comradeship and the sharing of burdens. And since a technological science has placed in our hands the tools necessary for Utopia, do we any longer need a God, or all the machinery of prayer and praise addressed to the mythical figure of religious imagination? Make way for a practical gospel, for putting into practice at last what even the Christian ethic has mouthed for so long. Let us, if Christianity is still a thing to conjure with, have Christianity without God.

On a signboard of the Hitler Youth at Halle on the Saale one may read these words: "Where are the enemies of our Hitler youth? They are the religious fanatics who still today fall on their knees with wistful looks directed upward, who spend their time attending churches and praying. We, as Hitler boys, can regard only with contempt or derision young people who still today run to their ridiculous Evangelical or Catholic clubs to give themselves up to eminently superfluous religious reveries."

There you have, though in exaggerated and sketchy form, perhaps, the rival religion to Christianity of our time. It is, as I have tried to show, a Christian heresy, inconceivable in a thought world untouched by the Christian view of man. But it is a gospel of faith in man, not God. Man, especially social man, is the source of his own salvation. It is a gospel of human pride.

And as Christianity, granted that it is the Christianity of the Christian Creed, and of the fellowship of the Christian mystery, confronts this secularized world, how shall it proceed? How shall it even state its case? Its very vocabulary has been forgotten or at best is misunderstood. Even ancient words like grace and sin and forgiveness seem irrelevant. They imply a God. They suggest that man's first problem, yes, even for the beauteous ordering of his social life, is to establish contact with his creator. For without a belief in God, and a conviction that He is the ultimate reality, a word like sin loses all meaning. It implies someone without ourselves who cares what we do. An atheist cannot even swear.

No, the task of Christian apologetics is not an easy one today. It cannot condemn the newer humanist gospels on purely ethical grounds, though it may be shocked and puzzled at the racial hatred of Germany or the cruelty of a Russian commissar. The secularist gospel may even be complimented for seizing upon the ideals of Christianity itself. The admiration for a human Jesus, so frequently found in even atheist writings, is surely right so far as it goes. Yet what a gulf divides the gospel of Humanism from the historic Christian faith! It lives in a different world of spiritual values.

And clearly, even on critical human grounds, we can confront the secularist gospel with two fundamental questions: first, a question regarding its goal, and secondly, a question regarding the means of achieving that goal.

A critical view of the goal of the humanist gospel needs to point to only one fact—that such a goal is a temporal one, and ignores man's hunger for eternity. Decked out in all its grandeur, with its utopian dreams all realized, what can be its end except death? Can it, even when achieved, satisfy even a fraction of the needs of man?

"The proud man's contumely,
The pangs of dispriz'd love, the law's delay,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of the unworthy takes."

All these might still be there. It might not solve even such a problem as that of the wallflower at a dance. No social system can equalize charm or mental talent, or personal attractiveness. Yet these inequalities probably cause as much tragedy in people's lives as poverty.

As W. G. Peck puts it in an eloquent passage:

"Even if it were possible to conceive the abiding establishment of a human republic, 'world-unity, with collaboration in the extraction, manufacture, transport and distribution of natural resources for the equal benefit of all,' apart from the tradition and realization of a common redemption, shared grace, and an organic community of prayer and worship, what value or final spiritual relevance would reside in such an order? How would it support and refresh the heart of man, or sustain the secret dignity without which men sink from their manhood before the challenge of life and death? From any secular Utopia, where the soul meets nothing more than a worldly world, a man might turn as Wordsworth turned from the earthly scene in his own day, ready to prefer even the dead dreams of paganism to a world where there was neither faith nor vision. Materialism and acquisitiveness, even could they be shaped into a universal collectivism, would still be materialism and acquisitiveness."

I turn to the second of the questions which one can ask of the secularist gospel: Granted that your goal were desirable, how can you achieve it with purely human means? The ideal of human brotherhood is one of our Christian ideals, of course. But has man ever been moved much by ideals, unanchored in a faith in God? Is not the very word "brother" meaningless without the concept of a common father? Ideals, surely, have been cheap since the dawn of history. A child of ten could sketch a fairly adequate human Utopia. The ten commandments themselves are not ideals. They are commandments of a living, righteous God, who rewardeth the just and the unjust. Turn the Christian gospel into nothing more than a humanitarian ideal, with the story of its central figure nothing more than an exemplarist biography, will it really for long move the hearts of men? It may simply lead me to despair—as might an analogous appeal that as musician I copy a Kreisler or a Paderewski. The Christian story has not abolished the law. But it is itself not the law but the gospel—a gospel of good news to those who have been made humble of heart by the vision and the fear of God.

The secularist gospel, with its trust in unredeemed man, must abide by that trust. It can exhort, but it cannot command, unless it appeals to the arbitrament of the sword, to G. P. U., or guillotine axe. "Quarry the granite rock with razors," says Cardinal Newman, "or move a vessel with a thread of silk; then may you hope with such keen and delicate instruments as human

knowledge and human reason to contend against those giants, the passion and the pride of man."

Or as G. K. Chesterton puts it, in one of his last essays:

"I do not believe that social salvation could be achieved, or even approached, by anything like a mere improvement in social machinery, or the establishment of Bureaus for Everything. I think it happens only when there is a strong sense of duty and dignity implanted in people, not by any government or even any school, but by something which they recognize as making a secret call upon a solitary soul. I do not believe in Men like Gods; but I do believe in Men with Gods; or, preferably (such is my fastidious taste in such matters), a God."

It is in direct appeal once more to the realities of human experience, to the common sense of common men and women that the hope of Christian apologetics lies. The secular gospel may fool us for a time, particularly a time when the Church has herself played traitor to her trust. But disillusionment is sure to follow. Sooner or later we face the ultimate questions of human life: death and sin. No amount of sentimental gilding will abolish these from human experience.

"The whole of modern philosophy," says Emil Brunner in a recent essay, "from Descartes on, insofar as it has not degenerated into a crass materialism and cynicism, has been a series of variations upon this one theme—the divine truth in man. The fearfulness of recent historical events has given the death blow to this faith. The problems of evil and of death, so diligently avoided by modern thought, now press upon us with their full weight. For him who can no longer disregard these two realities, the idealistic and the rationalistic thinking of the Enlightenment are forever impossible. For him there remain only two possibilities—cynicism or Christian faith. This new comprehension of human reality, this knowledge of evil, is as characteristic a starting point for the new kind of theological thinking as is the reality of God."

And let these ultimate realities once more loom large on the horizon of consciousness, and the Christian gospel will regain a hearing. For that gospel is precisely a gospel of redemption from evil and from death. It is a drama of salvation—the news of a great fact, and of a great action, of something God has done for us by being Himself born of a virgin and dying for us on a cross. "A thousand *oughts*," says Baron Friedrich von Hügel, "cannot take the place of one *is*."

We shall rediscover the marvel and the glory of that gospel. We may

have to pass through the judgments of God before we once more hear with our ears and see with our eyes. We may, as Karl Barth suggests, have to be brought to the edge of anguish. In the lives of thousands today this is already happening. And when it does happen to a man, he is ready for the old, old story—the story of a Father who pitieth His children, and remembers that they are but dust, who has set us into a world of vanishing time, but has redeemed us from death, who has so loved the world (yes, this world of sin and apparently meaningless vanity of vanities) “that he gave his only-begotten Son, to the end that all who believe in him should not perish but have everlasting life.” A God who can forgive us our sins and give us the fellowship of His Holy Ghost because He has Himself suffered for us upon a cross.

And the Christian Church, confronted with the demand for social salvation, may rediscover her own half-forgotten mission as the kingdom and the family of God. When all other means of social salvation have failed—the sentimentalist with his ideals, and the cynic with his ruthless sword—she may again gather men into her brotherhood, the brotherhood of the altar rail and of the Body of Christ. That, in fact, is what we are doing when we are performing our proper task in the Church—building round the altar cells of the kingdom of God. And the motive behind that brotherhood is today, as it has been through the centuries, a response, not to mere ethical idealism nor to the law, but to God’s prevenient Grace. As W. G. Peck declares, in an eloquent defense of the social significance of the Christian creed: “When I say ‘I believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, Our Lord’ I declare that I know not only what God is, but also that I know what every man is. I know that the poorest, the vilest, has family connections with the King of Kings.

“If we really had got it into our heads and hearts that a human mother once bore a baby who was the eternal Son of God, we should never rest until we had made of this sin-stained and battered humanity something more worthy of such a faith. If God has become man, human personality is sacred, and we ought to flame with holy anger against all that debases it and against every interest vested in vice. No social reformer can safely set out without some doctrine of man; and there is no doctrine of man so full of revolutionary hope as this: That while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.”

Realistic Imperialism

D. ELTON TRUEBLOOD

THE dream of empire is no passing fancy of the human spirit, but one of its most enduring features. The elementary principle of imperialism, the inclusion of many different peoples and lands under a single rule, is one of the principles which man finds it hard to reject even when he denounces the way in which the principle is ordinarily made effective. Thus one does not need to be an Italian to understand the vast appeal of a reconstructed Roman Empire, bringing order into the chaos of small, competing tribes, and carrying the influence of the Eternal City even into the heart of Africa. While we condemn the actualization of the dream, we are not impervious to its attractiveness. It is hard to withhold a certain admiration for the way in which a strong people, vigorous and decisive, has been able so frequently to spread its dominion over those who outnumber them so greatly.

The long history of imperialism, from the ascendancy of Egypt and Babylonia to that of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the conquest of Ethiopia, is a record of vast importance for psychology and an ample refutation of the economic interpretation of history. It has been shown repeatedly that Germany's prewar colonies were not economically advantageous to her and that they would not be economically advantageous now. The probability that the Italian nation will profit from the conquest of Ethiopia in access to new raw materials or in actual large-scale colonization is slight. It must be the truth that men love empire for other reasons.

As part of their love of empire millions gladly march and shout extravagant praises of other men whose weaknesses are obvious to the detached observer. The imperial leader struts in every conceivable theatrical pose and has his picture taken for the inspiration of his followers. Instead of laughing at such actions, men willingly sacrifice even their lives to honor Caesar and enlarge the empire. This seems singularly irrational, and the fact that men do it in such numbers is as instructive as it is pathetic.

I

The truth is that men and women cannot bear to be *small* and they make

up for their personal smallness by the elation of belonging to something larger. If the average Italian feels that the empire is growing, that his nation has the fastest ship, or that his army has conquered part of Africa, he may still be as inconsequential as he ever was in his home or his village, but he feels better because he belongs to something that is magnificent. In the same way, the average German may have his private economic worries and be hampered in countless legal restrictions, but he bears his limitations gladly because Germany has become once more a first-rate power, because Germany again has a fleet, and because there is a military patrol in the Rhineland.

In the United States of America the average citizen apparently experiences a certain elation from the fact that our nation is continental in scope. "From the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf," has long been a staple form of appeal on the part of Fourth of July orators. The ordinary British subject undoubtedly feels some enhancement as he notes the red spots on the world map, though he may have had no part whatever in the spread of the empire. Empire is a sacred word because it seems to transcend ordinary national restrictions.

One of the most brilliant contributions of the late Arthur Clutton-Brock was the coining of a highly suggestive phrase, "pooled self-esteem."¹ This philosopher pointed out the fact that most men are not willing to praise themselves directly and singularly, whereas they are highly pleased to be able to do so indirectly and plurally. Thus a college student will hardly say, "I am the biggest and the best," but he will join with five hundred others in shouting or singing, "We are the biggest and the best." By pooling our self-esteem we disguise, even from ourselves, our boastfulness, and thus engage in the pleasant exercise of eating our cake and having it.

But pooled self-esteem, while understandable or even humorous, may be terribly dangerous. The Caesar who happens to be a skillful psychologist, and he can hardly become a Caesar otherwise, knows how to manipulate the vicarious sense of grandeur for his own ends. If he feels his hold slipping, he may decide to engage in some new conquest at the expense of totally innocent persons, because the conquest will enhance the sense of group power and thus consolidate his own position as the symbol of power.

The danger is correspondingly greater if whole nations are suffering from a pathological sense of inferiority. The citizens are then so thankful

¹ Cf. A. Clutton-Brock, "Pooled Self-Esteem," in *Essays on Religion*, New York, 1926.

to the leader for helping them to escape from this condition that their passionate loyalty knows no bounds.

Men inflamed with loyalties so obviously irrational, can be led to do very strange things and no one knows what bloodshed a diseased veneration may entail. Loyalty, like religion, may be very bad as well as very good. Enlargement of life by the expedient of Caesar-worship has a certain glitter, but the reality may be sordid. We do well to remind ourselves how sordid it became in ancient Rome in spite of the grand talk about the Roman sway. Tacitus, in his famous history, faced this realistically and said:

"The history on which I am entering is that of a period rich in disasters, terrible with battles, torn by civil struggles, horrible even in peace."²

The evidence is abundant that men hate restricted smallness so badly that they will take almost any means of avoiding it. It may be avoided in either real or imaginary ways, and the imaginary ways are numerous. The imaginary forms of enlargement always present themselves as shortcuts and this makes them doubly tempting. The use of intoxicating beverages is to be explained almost wholly on this basis. The man who has a sufficient amount of alcohol in his system feels large, expansive, and successful. His financial worries are forgotten; his ordinary personal limitations are temporarily and magically overcome.

Sometimes the imaginary ways of escape into enlargement of life are so pathetic that we cannot find it in our hearts to condemn them. This is the case in regard to the American Negro of the slave period. What we now call "Spirituals" are eloquent witnesses to a way of enlargement that was both imaginary and temporary, but it harmed nobody and it was wonderfully efficacious while it lasted. The slave slipped out of his cruel world of overseers and cotton patches to a world where men played harps of gold. The Negro slave had his own pathetic kind of imperialism, but it was not dangerous, whereas so many of the imaginary ways of enlargement are dangerous in the extreme.

II

If we take these psychological facts seriously we cannot fail to conclude that one of the greatest and most enduring human needs is some way of enlarging the domain of man in a fashion that is real rather than imaginary, and that is beneficial rather than harmful to other men. If the human spirit is intrin-

² *The Histories*, I, ii.

sically imperialistic, the path of wisdom lies in discovering the principles of a realistic imperialism which will perform truly the office which the various imaginary imperialisms perform delusively.

Professor Bliss Perry apparently had this in mind when he spoke some memorable words on the occasion of the unveiling of the bust of President Eliot at Eliot House, Harvard, in honor of the hundredth anniversary of the great president's birth. The speaker applied to President Eliot the striking term, *amplificator imperii*. Eliot, said Professor Perry, was "an enlarger of the empire of man's estate. His mind was Roman rather than Greek: he cared little for speculative subtleties, he distrusted introspection. . . . He was primarily an organizer and administrator, with an imperial grasp of fact." That Bliss Perry believed these words important is indicated by the fact that he repeated them in his autobiography, a book which everywhere illustrates this theme.

We are so accustomed to the practice of reserving such terms for soldiers or statesmen that, at first, it seems strange to apply "enlarger of empire" to a man who was a teacher, but, upon reflection, the language is appropriate. Eliot made this world a larger one for unnumbered persons. It has been said with justice that he influenced American education more than did any of his contemporaries. Thousands of students, not only at Harvard, but elsewhere, have had their horizons enlarged because he worked and lived. He did not add any land to the American republic, but he added new stature to the American spirit. When President Eliot let his name be used in connection with the famous "five foot shelf" he helped to bring classics of various nations within the reach of the ordinary reader, whereas many of these books had been formerly known and loved by scholars alone. The frontiers must have receded perceptibly for many a lonely reader, and in this kind of enlargement there is *reality*. The lonely reader really occupies a larger room in the universe because he has increased his "dominion over experience." The man himself is larger, for we grow by appreciation and understanding, and his enhancement is neither imaginary nor delusive. The acquirement of Ethiopia does not bring the individual Italian any more room or more wealth, and the *prestige* it brings is highly fanciful, but the man who adds to his life an acquaintance with the mighty dead has experienced an enhancement that is genuine.

Many, both among the dead and the living, have pushed back our hori-

zons, not by what they have *done*, but by what they have *been*. Some live so radiantly that the rest of us, watching them and trying to follow their example, have some new conception of how big man's empire may be. They raise our lowly expectations.

Moreover, in this realm what becomes the acquisition of one is not automatically lost to another as in territorial empire, where enlargement really means transfer. When Doctor Eliot placed John Woolman's *Journal* in the first volume of his five-foot shelf, many lives were enlarged by their new knowledge of that pure and lovely New Jersey tailor, but Woolman was not thereby lost to his old admirers.

The word *amplificator* suggests the man of action rather than the man of thought, but there is no reason why a man must choose between these two, unless action is understood in a superficial sense. The word was used by Cicero and applied to Pythagoras in the Roman's effort to show how the man who was the first to call himself a philosopher was also a social force in the life of *Magna Graecia*.

It is heartening to realize that long ago some men knew the double truth that man's life demands expansion and that this expansion may take place in constructive and unselfish fashions. Twenty-five centuries ago a Hebrew poet wrote to his fellow Hebrews in what might be considered the best imperialistic vein:

"Enlarge the place of thy tent and let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations; spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes. For thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left, and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles and make the desolate cities to be inhabited."³

The people to whom these brave words were addressed did not even occupy their own land, but the poet told them to enlarge the borders and stretch the tent curtains back to include more. Was he talking about the formation of a Hebrew empire or did he mean something far more profound?

There is a remarkable sense in which the poetic dream has been fulfilled for the people to whom it was originally addressed. These despised Hebrews, especially because of the prophetic movement of which these words are one product, have affected the whole world and thus enlarged their tent more than they could have believed to be possible. He who has so affected the world that His birth constitutes our date line was born to a woman who belonged to this then captive people.

³ Isaiah 54. 2, 3.

But, though the poetic dream referred in the first instance and can still refer to the Hebrew nation, there is a perfectly valid sense in which it can refer and ought to refer to the entire human race. The history of mankind ought to be the story of the enlargement of the tent of the whole race, the progressive pushing back of the curtains of our habitation not as nationals, but as men. The genius of man, as man, lies in the continuous enlargement of his horizons, without the restriction of the horizons of others. Much of this has already occurred.

This continuous enlargement has been obvious in a purely physical or geographical sense. Step by step we have pushed the curtains back, never willingly allowing any available space to remain undiscovered or unconquered. Most of us are thrilled as we read the true stories of actual discovery and we are glad that some of these discoveries have come in our time. In our generation has come the discovery of both poles, first by land and then by air. Now one of the poles has actually become a place of human habitation and successful flight from hemisphere to hemisphere by way of polar regions is an accomplished fact.

One of the thrilling objects of this planet is the tiny boat, which carried men for the first time through the Northwest Passage after centuries of baffled effort. It helps us to know that our century compares favorably with others in discovery. In like manner, we, who live in the United States, are justly proud of the fact that Americans have had an important share in the exploration of new lands. Rear-Admiral Richard E. Byrd has done something important for America in that he has kept alive in our citizens the fine old sense of courageous exploration. Indeed, it is quite possible that the chief service of modern explorers has lain, not in what they have discovered, but in what they have done to human spirits. Captain Scott, by his courageous death in the Antarctic, has had an incalculable influence for good on the English nation and on literate people everywhere. Other men have had the privilege of enlarging the borders of the British empire, but Scott had the privilege of enlarging the borders of the human spirit.

Perhaps the real enlargement is *always* an enlargement of spirit. It has been fine to feel that we are always pushing back the frontier, but actually the whole earth is not a very large place, especially when measured in terms of possible speed of travel, which seems to be a valid method of measurement. And when we compare the area of our earth with the size of the known cosmos, our conclusion has still greater force. It is the peculiar glory of man that

the size of his particular abode or of his body has practically nothing to do with the domain of his experience, for the latter is a matter of the spirit and is not limited by time or space. Thoreau lived in a large world when his physical environment was restricted to Walden Pond.

III

There are three particular ways and one general way in which the empire of man's spiritual estate may be enlarged. The first particular way is by *knowledge*. "Man is a reed," wrote Pascal, "one of the feeblest things in nature, but a *thinking* reed." In one sense man is insignificant, but in another his life is truly majestic. Man is so wide-ranging in his power of knowing—he can include in his mental processes the distant stars, but the stars, for all their size, cannot include him. Light travels at a tremendous speed, but man knows how fast it travels and his thought travels faster. His thought can include in one grasp both the source and the end of the light ray. Some stars are so distant that it takes years for light from them to reach us, but man's thought can go there and back in the twinkling of an eye.

In the same way man's thought is wide-ranging in time. We can think of the ancient Greeks and receive benefit from their urbanity, just as we can think of the ancient Hebrews and profit by their spiritual insight. We push back the tent curtains, hundreds, thousands, even millions of years, as we learn to read the language of past events. We can also push into the future, though with less certainty. Many people suppose that the time will come when the energy of the cosmos will be dissipated and life as we know it quite impossible. Man's life and all his works will be destroyed, but he at least knows that the destruction will come.

The point is that knowing means enlargement. There is an important sense in which a mind is equal to whatever it comprehends, and no one supposes that we have reached a limit to our pushing back of the curtains, thus enlarging the area of knowledge and lessening the area of ignorance. Indeed, it does not appear that there is any theoretical limit to the knowing process. Many fields once called unknowable are now well known and there are still countless fields yet relatively untouched. When we have learned all there is to know about the external world there is still the vast domain of the world of inner experience open for discovery.

The second particular way in which the empire of man's estate may be enlarged is by *manipulation*. We not only know, but we can also do, and, when our environment is not satisfactory, we modify it. We are so accus-

tomed to agriculture that we seldom wonder at it. A man takes a bare field and by skillful manipulation of soil, fertilizer and seeds or plants, makes it a thing of beauty. Ditches are filled, hedges planted, lawns developed, and all this is because man is the kind of creature who has a genius, as in the words of the Hebrew poet, for enlarging his tents and stretching forth the curtains of his habitation. The domestication of animals was one of the early steps in this enlargement. Man may have been weak, but he was able to make strong creatures serve his purposes.

In modern times what we call industrial advance is merely an extension of the principle embodied in the domestication of the brutes. We have domesticated steam, oil, and natural gas. We enlarge the empire of our estate, not only by discovering new lands, but by stretching railroads across known lands, by establishing air lines, by building bridges. It is obvious that the citizens of San Francisco have their domain of experience constructively enlarged by the presence of the two new bridges. A need has been met, man's power to shape natural forces has been demonstrated. Indeed it is hard to believe that a race which can bridge San Francisco Bay cannot some day bridge the barriers of hatred between nations.

Our natural voices are weak, but, by manipulation of what is around us, we can make them carry far, even to the very farthest points on the earth's surface or far up above the earth. In this, as in so much else that we do, our manipulation rests upon prior understanding, but it should be noted that the understanding need not be complete for the manipulation to be effective. We really understand very little about the essential nature of electricity, but we have long been able to employ it.

Life was once defined as adjustment to environment. This may or may not be a good definition, but, in any case, human life is that which adjusts the environment to its own needs. And this adjustment is a form of enlargement.

The third and the most important of the particular ways in which the empire of man's spiritual estate is widened is by *appreciation*. We perceive, as we observe our widening world, that some things are beautiful and some are ugly. We judge that some actions are good, whereas others are bad. Our understanding of persons and the works of persons leads inevitably to praise and blame. We are, in short, creatures whose tents are enlarged by virtue of the fact that we can and do *value*.

If there is a valid sense in which a mind is equal to what it comprehends,

there is an equally valid sense in which a mind *owns* what it appreciates. This truth becomes clear in our relation to landscape. Nearly all of us have some spot to which we return again and again, always with renewed or increased love. It is part of our real domain though, in most instances, we do not hold title to such land or pay taxes on it. Sometimes the spot we love is what we call public property, supposedly owned by all, but it is really owned by as many as enjoy it and no more. Only one person can hold title to land, but with appreciation it is different; the ownership which comes from appreciation does not prohibit a similar ownership on the part of others.

The enlargement of our domain through appreciation is noteworthy, not only in regard to the works of nature, but also in regard to the works of our fellow men. Most of us cannot create great poetry or paint great pictures or design magnificent buildings, but this we can do, we can learn to enjoy, to evaluate, to appreciate what men of genius have made. If you learn to love and understand a really great symphony, your domain has been enlarged, for the symphony is part of you, even if you cannot play the simplest instrument. There is an artistry of appreciation as well as of production, and perhaps the one is as exalted as the other. Certainly each is a form of excellence. But whereas productive genius is rare, so that artists are born rather than made, appreciative genius can be cultivated in almost any person. The capacity to appreciate is intrinsic and can be made extrinsic by teaching.

Here is a field in which we have made only the slightest beginning. We are always becoming aware of what is valuable or lovely when we had no intimation of its significance earlier. If this has been true up to now, it will assuredly continue to be true. Probably our sensitivity to color, to pattern, to genuine worth can be improved indefinitely. A good education should be as much a matter of appreciation as of information.

The act of appreciation often tells more about the individual who judges than about what is judged. We know the measure of a man when we know what he loves or does not love. Thus a person who says he does not like Shakespeare or Dante tells us very little about these authors, but very much about himself, since he is declaring his own lack of sensitivity. We truly say that all judgment of others is really a judgment upon the self.

One of the most important facts about the human race is the well-nigh universal veneration for Jesus Christ. This tells us something about Christ,

but more about man in general. There is hope for a race in which even the illiterate place their highest loyalty so accurately and well.

IV

The particular ways in which expansion may be genuine all point in one direction—outward. We grow as we give up dreams in favor of reality. In the search for knowledge we find what would be true whether we knew it or not. In manipulation the engineer and inventor must deal with the stubborn stuff of nature which is quite unmindful of his wishes. In appreciation we thrill, not to what is in us, but to what is outside us, beckoning to us with compelling power. The beauty is there, waiting to be apprehended. When our appreciation of music changes, the change is in us and not in the music. When we are responsive to an artist's message we find beauty and worth, not in our appreciation, but in the picture. We are always enlarged by relation to the genuinely *objective*.

This fact suggests that what fundamentally and primarily restricts men is *subjectivity*, the interest of each in self. It is because the self-esteem of so many has been wounded that hysterical efforts to demonstrate superiority are abundant. The blustering type of imperialism does not solve the problem because it is still the self that is the focus of attention, at least on the part of the imperial leader. A self-styled leader is often most truly in bondage, living in a very small world, because his world is bounded on all sides by his narrow interests which are limited to himself. This is demonstrated by the fact that the tyrant must always hear new proclamations of his greatness and new attestations of the loyalty of his followers.

The only way to be truly free, to live in really large empire, is to achieve the objective mood so that the interest of the self is wholly centered on something outside the self. Often this brings both happiness and peace. A person engaged in the testing of some objective truth often forgets to worry about his personal popularity or success and breathes consequently a free imperial air. The greatest freedom comes not with a self-conscious effort to be free, but rather in a new bondage, a bondage to what so commands our interest and loyalty that we forget ourselves. This is a paradox but a profound one. We become free by being bound to what is really worthy of our obedience, and our lives are enlarged as we become personally unimportant in dependence upon that which is important in its own right.

In popular philosophizing there is a great deal of talk of the supreme

worth of personality, but this principle may be either vague or positively misleading. The worth of men lies not in what they are, in and of themselves, but in what they become by attachment to what is inherently valuable. Of itself, human life may be sordid, selfish, and trivial, occupied by small vanities, petty jealousies and unworthy ambitions. Any conception of the worth of personality which evades this unpleasant fact is sheer romance and sentimentality.

The worth of human personality lies in our flair for objectivity. Because we can attach our interest and loyalty to what is seen as worthy, irrespective of our relation to it, we can share in the value of what occupies our interest. Human life is like a cloud which has no color in itself, but can take on magnificent colors from the sun.

The Christian religion has not made the grave mistake of becoming sentimentally optimistic about man as man. From the first, Christian thinkers have viewed man realistically, which is the reason for the doctrine of original sin, but they have, at the same time, shown that man can attach himself to what is bigger than himself. It has been the first task of the Christian religion to lead men out into enlarged areas of experience. The parable of the Good Samaritan has, as its point, the enlargement of the notion of obligation and the consequent freedom from restricting bonds.

Our best illustrations of how life may thus be enhanced may be seen in science, in art, and in moral endeavor. An obscure scientist, shut in his tiny laboratory, is often an occupant of a really large room because his concern is with the truth. He is searching for a deeper knowledge of what is true, not what he wishes were true. Here he steps into a realm in which the pettiness of self is left behind. He may live trivially at other times, but while he is pure scientist he has found the secret of human enlargement. Truth holds him in thrall and thereby he becomes free.

It is hardly necessary to say that a similar objectivity is often achieved in creative art. The artist has a vision which holds him fast until it is transferred to some medium by which he can make others see what he has seen in advance. Any creative task brings release from the bondage of self, at least temporarily.

The kind of objectivity we have described is good, but it does not provide a stopping place. The logic of objectivity leads us on to the love of God, a phrase which sounds strange in modern ears. In our deepest moments we find that Truth and Beauty have about them a compelling quality that is

only understandable if the experience is a revelation from spirit to spirit. The height of the objective mood comes in worship in which the individual forgets himself utterly as he contemplates the reality of God's presence. In religious experience the extra-personal reference reaches its culmination.

In the scientific search for truth and the artistic search for beauty, as well as the love of our neighbor, we find only partial and temporary enlargement of domain, whereas the love of God is *completely* what these are partially. Above truth is the Author of truth and above beauty is the Father of beauty, just as above human love is the love that moves the sun in heaven and all the other stars. If men could believe in Him as a reality, feel the absolute demands which His being entails, then at last there would be real expansion of domain. Our little lives would cease to hold our attention in view of this supreme Object and, paradoxically, our little lives would be enlarged by the contact of the divine Spirit.

But the love of God must be *thoroughly* objective. To be valid it must be, as Dean Sperry has told us, the "unmercenary love of God." Anyone who loves God for what God will do for him has not even begun to understand. Such instrumental love would drive us back into the confines of the self which it is the task of life to transcend. Only as we see God as worthy of reverence for His own sake and as we freely offer that reverence do we come into the larger room which is our true home. This, it would seem, is the meaning of the too often quoted sentence from the beginning of Augustine's *Confessions*.

The logic of realistic imperialism leads ultimately to the kingdom of God. It seems a strange conclusion, but it is derivable from the facts. To be free means to escape the trivial stuffy quarters we chiefly know, and to get out into a large and roomy space. And this is achieved by obedience to the ancient command, "Love not self. Love God."

Art as the Vehicle for Religious Worship

THEODORE M. GREENE

THE thesis I am going to defend is that art is essential to religion. I shall argue that the heart of religion is worship, that worship requires a vehicle, and that art provides the best, and indeed the only adequate, vehicle for such worship.

How shall we proceed in our analysis of art and religion? Many scholars today favor the "lowest common denominator" approach to these subjects, believing that the essence of art and religion consists in what all types of experience which might conceivably be called religious or aesthetic have in common. This approach invites preoccupation with the more primitive forms of art and religion and neglect of their more developed expressions. An alternative approach is suggested by Aristotle's doctrine that the true essence of a temporal phenomenon is most adequately revealed in its most developed forms, in the oak rather than in the acorn. According to this view the essential character of art and religion can best be discovered in the higher forms of religious devotion and of aesthetic creation and response. We shall adopt the latter approach and concentrate our attention upon Christianity rather than primitive religions, upon the fine arts and literature rather than more general aesthetic intuition. Our conclusions will, I believe, be applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to the more amorphous types of religious and aesthetic experience.

Basic Characteristics of Religion as Exemplified in Christianity

The Christian experience may be analyzed, at least for our present purpose, into three basic aspects or moments which, though organically related, are distinguishable. These are, first, the act of worship, second, moral endeavor, and third, intellectual inquiry. Each is necessary to the Christian life, but worship is the most basic of the three since, without it, Christianity, like other religions, would cease to be a *religion* at all and would become mere theoretical speculation or mere moral conduct.

Christian worship, both public and private, is itself a complex process. It is, first of all, an act of communion between man and Deity. The skeptic would of course deny this; he would admit the psychological factuality of

religious belief and grant its sociological significance but repudiate its claim to ontological reference. The believer, in contrast, conceives of worship as a genuine transaction between Deity and the finite soul. And, for the Christian, God's contribution is primary, since, without the Divine Initiative, man would not even be impelled to search for God. This does not lessen, however, the importance of man's response; it is a Christian's duty to do everything in his power to respond to the Divine Initiative as completely and effectively as possible.

Christian worship is, in the second place, a response of the whole man, at once a cognitive, conative, and emotive activity. It involves belief in an objectively real Deity capable of being known; the Christian asserts that, in successful communion, he is able to achieve genuine spiritual insight. This insight, however, is not coldly intellectual knowledge; it is a knowledge characterized by deep emotional fervor and, for that very reason, more adequate to its Object than is mere intellectual apprehension. Worship is also conative; the worshiper must will not only to enter into communion with God but to satisfy, so far as he is able, the moral and religious prerequisites to such communion. Knowledge, emotion, and will are thus organically fused in worship; will is directed by knowledge and vitalized by emotion, emotion is made significant by thought and translated into resolve and action, reflection is animated by emotion and actualized in volitional endeavor.

It is just because Christian worship at its best is so dependent upon the co-operation of the mind, the will, and the emotions that moral conduct on the one hand, historical and theological inquiry on the other, are essential to its spiritual integrity. Divorced from historical fact, centering in the Incarnation, Christianity ceases to be Christian and becomes a type of natural religion. Hence the necessity for imaginative historical scholarship. Divorced from systematic conceptual analysis Christianity, like other religions, degenerates into superstition and sentimentality. Divorced from sincere moral effort, Christian rites become ritualistic magic and Christian intuition lapses into non-Christian mysticism. Whatever may be true of other religions, Christianity must be defined in terms of its special insistence on historical orientation, reflective interpretation, and moral sensitivity.

Worship, then, in its relation to morality and rational investigation, is *primus inter pares*; without them *Christian* worship at least becomes impossible. Yet worship remains *PRIMUS inter pares*, the core and essence of the Christian *religion*. I have emphasized the importance of morality, his-

tory and theology in order that what follows may be viewed in proper perspective. Yet neither historical research as such, nor theology and philosophy as such, nor social and individual morality as such, constitute the true essence of the Christian religion. There are times when what is chiefly needed is prophetic exhortation to quicken the social and individual conscience; there are also times when only a return to history can correct deistic error and when only rational analysis can clear away the mists of a superstitious *Schwärmerei*. Indeed, the need for exhortation, history, and analysis is perennial. None the less, worship must always occupy the center of the stage; for, apart from Christian worship, history is bound to lose its distinctively Christian teleological significance, theology must shrivel into arid dogma or evaporate into philosophical abstraction devoid of Christian meaning, and morality must transform itself into whatever social beliefs and practices are compatible with natural religion or philosophical naturalism.

If, then, worship is of such pre-eminent importance in the Christian religion, questions as to the nature of worship and the conditions of its possibility become correspondingly urgent. What, we must ask, takes place in the mind during the act of public or private communion? If successful worship depends in part upon man's attitude, how may the adoption of the appropriate attitude be facilitated? If communion is in any sense an apprehension of Deity, what is the form and what are the conditions of such insight? And if emotion plays an inevitable part, how may such emotion be canalized, motivated and rendered religiously significant?

Questions such as these at once suggest that worship, like all significant human activity, requires a *vehicle*. Our minds and bodies being what they are, we can apprehend reality only in and through an expressive medium or "language."¹ And only with the aid of an appropriate vehicle can we crystallize a religious attitude or render an emotion religiously meaningful. In short, if worship is to be significant, mind, will, and feeling must be effectively directed and controlled, and such direction and control are possible only with the aid of a suitable expressive vehicle suitably employed.

There have, indeed, been religious mystics who have argued that the ecstatic vision transcends all human vehicles as it transcends all thought, imagination, memory, and sense. Man must, they say, empty his mind of content, he must starve and subdue his faculties into a state of complete

¹ Cf. Croce, *Aesthetic*, p. 8. "Every true intuition . . . is also expression. . . . The spirit only intuits in making, forming, expressing."

quiescence, in order that Deity may be free to flood the vacant mind and the empty soul with a light whose essence is unknowable, inexpressible, and incommunicable by mortal man.² In its extreme form such mystic doctrine seriously misapprehends the nature and conditions of Christian worship. For such worship, though it may *culminate* in silence and passivity, involves, as a dynamic *process*, the most intense activity of thought, will, and imagination. During the act of worship the mind is not empty but full, not passive but active. This activity, however, is of a distinctive type. It is not the activity of mere rational analysis, cold, unemotional and impersonal; nor is it merely moral contrition and resolve; and though animated by imagery and feeling, its images and feelings, to have religious meaning, must be appropriate to, and expressive of, our sense of the Divine Presence. But this is possible only with the aid of a suitable language, medium or vehicle.

What then is this vehicle? I would suggest that the only adequate vehicle for religious worship, and particularly for Christian worship, is art in its largest and truest sense. To establish this thesis we must first examine the essential characteristics of art in general, as a vehicle for significant insight and expression. It should then be evident how certain forms of art mediate religious insight and promote religious worship.

The Fine Arts and Literature as Expressive Vehicles

A work of art may be defined as the distinctive expression of a meaning (or content) through organization (or form) of matter (or medium). The medium of art is the artistically unorganized material or "stuff" available to the artist for his creative endeavors. The form of a work of art is the order or pattern which he imposes on this medium for expressive purposes. The content of a work of art includes all that he succeeds in expressing in it through formal organization of the medium.

The outstanding characteristic of successful art is, of course, its organic unity. It is never a mere aggregate of externally related parts or elements; it is always, in proportion to its artistic excellence, an organic fusion of matter, form and content. The several arts, however, taken generically, differ in expressive potentiality; music and architecture, sculpture and painting, literature in its various forms and the art of pantomime, all employ radically

² Cf. *The Spiritual Letters of Dom Chapman*, p. 59. "In the intellect there is no perception at all, if prayer is pure. One might call it an act of ignorance, or a sensation of idiocy! . . . You ask yourself: 'What on earth do I mean by saying, I want God and nothing else?' and the only answer is: 'I don't mean anything.' 'What do I mean by God?' 'I have no idea.'"

different media; each medium, in turn, has its own characteristic principles of artistic organization; and each of the major arts, as a result, is able to express, in its own way, what the other major arts can either not express at all or only less effectively. Let us briefly examine each of the major arts with special reference to its expressive potentialities and limitations.

The art of pantomime and the dance is the simplest, the oldest, and, in a sense, the most universal of the major arts. Its medium is the human body, in motion and at rest; its forms include the innumerable patterns of pose and action of which the body is capable; its content is primarily emotional and conative. We know the eloquence of a handshake, a gesture or a facial expression. In the dance the expressive potentialities of bodily movement are richly exploited and universal human emotions and attitudes are directly expressed with clarity and power.

The medium of music is sound and silence; yet not all sounds, but only those which can be produced in pitch by available musical instruments and the human voice and which allow of organization into some system of musically related tones expressible in a scale. Its forms include the innumerable ways in which these tones, set off by musically significant rests, can be organized into musically coherent patterns. The basic principles of such organizations are melody, polyphony, and harmony; examples of generic musical forms are fugue and canon, chorale and minuet, sonata and symphony. Here, as in the other arts, artistically significant form is ultimately unique; conformity to this or that generic form is no guarantee of musical excellence; but these unique forms allow of generic classification.

What, now, is the content of music? What does expressive music express? Like the dance, it expresses emotions and conative attitudes, feeling and mood. But what emotions and attitudes? Here a distinction is imperative. A successful musical composition expresses, in the first place, the composer's *aesthetic* emotions experienced during the act of composition, and our delight in the intrinsically satisfying musical pattern (the interplay of melodic lines, the progress of harmonic sequences, the nuances of tonal relations and contrasting timbres) is our musical response to pure musical quality which is embodied in the product of the composer's creative genius. But truly expressive music is more than mere "aesthetic surface"; it expresses also such *universal human* emotions as joy and sorrow, assurance and despair. These labels, however, are far too crude to do justice to the infinite variety of our ever-changing emotional states and attitudes. Music has the power,

denied to conceptual analysis, of expressing man's kaleidoscopic emotions and conations with unrivaled precision and subtlety. This is why we cannot express in words the ever-varying content of a musical composition. Thus music, like the dance, has its own expressive potentialities. It also has its expressive limitations, as will appear in our analysis of the other arts.

Architecture, like music, is an abstract art; its formal similarity to music has been immortalized in Ruskin's phrase "frozen music." Its medium, of course, distinguishes it from music; here stone and brick, wood and steel, take the place of sounds, and architectural forms create architectural spaces as musical patterns generate musical rests. In short, the medium of architecture is three-dimensional solids and voids; and these, in turn, give rise to patterns of color and texture, light and shade, just as the patterns of musical tones vary in timbre and sound intensity.

Architecture differs from music, however, in another and more important respect. A building is, in its very essence, a communal enterprise, a creature called into being by social demand and capable of fulfilling its proper function only in a social setting. True, the architect is usually a single individual; but not only must he invoke the aid of others to translate his thought into physical actuality—he must adapt his creative talents to a prior social need. He must, from the very first, know the social function which the projected edifice is to perform; he must, in the language of architecture, have a "program."

The architect's creative task is thus controlled, as is the work of no other artist, by the program which those who order the building and pay the bill prescribe. It is his duty as an engineer to build a building that will efficiently perform its utilitarian function—to provide shelter, whether for a king or for a private citizen, for secular activity or for religious worship. But it is also his duty, as an artist, to express the building's prescribed social function in the architectural medium. A building is artistically successful only in proportion as its architect has succeeded in this latter task. For the content of architecture, considered as an art, is its *program as expressed* in architectural proportion and form. That many buildings are thus expressive and that others fail in this respect must be clear to the most casual observer. Contrast the religious eloquence of a Notre Dame or a Chartres with the inexpressiveness or the irreverence of the coldest or ugliest church of your acquaintance; compare the regal grandeur proclaimed by the palace at Versailles, or the sense of domesticity expressed by a fine private dwelling, with

less happy ventures in state or domestic architecture. A building wisely built for proper aesthetic effect expresses by its very form the kind of social activity which it is intended to house.

Painting and sculpture differ from music and architecture in being in essence representational. This means that they, unlike the arts just considered, have a dual medium. Their physical or primary medium is, in the one case, canvas and pigment, paper and ink, or stained glass, and, in the other, stone or wood, clay or metal. Their secondary medium is their potential subject-matter, namely, all the visible objects and scenes which allow of pictorial or sculptural representation. It follows that the media of sculpture and painting are adequately exploited only in representational pictures and sculptures. We are all familiar today with modernistic abstractions, in which the artists have sought to express themselves solely through manipulation of the primary or physical medium. I would not deny a measure of artistic success to these enterprises; they can be looked at in the spirit in which music is heard, with a *somewhat* comparable aesthetic satisfaction. The history of both painting and sculpture, however, reveals the quixotic romanticism of these abstractionists; they have, in essence, forgotten that abstract musical form can express what abstract spatial form can only dimly echo; and they have also forgotten that sculpture and painting can represent, as music and architecture cannot, the visible world of nature. They and the writers of "program" music are both romantics at heart in their failure to recognize both the potentialities and the limitations of their respective media.

This does not mean, however, that mere literal reproduction, in paint or stone, of visible three-dimensional objects constitutes artistic excellence in these arts. Far from it—such slavish subservience to the object or scene represented is rather an indication of artistic impotence. Pictorial and sculptural representation possesses artistic significance only as an Aristotelian mean between wholly non-representational abstraction, on the one hand, and "photographically" faithful reproduction on the other. In short, the painter or sculptor must so select and interpret his subject-matter as to reveal its meaning and significance.

Now the perceptual world is composed of individual people, animals, and things. These individuals possess innumerable characteristics in common; yet each is unique as regards the peculiar pattern of universals which constitutes its relatively enduring essence. The painter and the sculptor, through mastery of artistic form and through wise selection, suppression, dis-

tortion, and other artistic devices, can reveal to us this or that universal trait or quality more clearly than nature herself reveals it. No mountains in nature as rugged as Cezanne's, no trees as feathery as Corot's, no human bodies as plastic as Michelangelo's. The artist can also, and simultaneously, portray with "supernatural" eloquence the distinctive physiognomy and character of human beings; witness the portraits of a Rembrandt or a Titian. Here, then, we have the clue to the distinctive content of sculpture and painting; it consists, first, of the universals which are indeed exemplified in nature, but which, in these arts, are set in relief and brought home to us with unusual directness and poignancy, and second, in the individuality of actual men and women interpreted and vividly portrayed in the pictorial or sculptural media.

Literature is the most complex of the arts. It too has a dual medium. Its primary medium is verbal language, its secondary medium, the whole world of inner and outer experience as potential subject-matter for literary treatment. Verbal language, however, has itself a dual nature, quite apart from the added symbolism of the printed word. The spoken word is, on the one hand, a pattern of sound; and this pattern, in turn, has an acquired meaning. Words are thus in essence symbolic as the primary media of the other arts are not; it is fanciful to regard colors or musical tones symbolically, red, for example, or a particular musical tone, as the symbol of passion—it is natural and proper to apprehend the meaning of a word or phrase when the appropriate sounds are uttered in our presence. The meaning of words, finally, is itself complex. Every word has, first of all, a conceptual core of meaning which the dictionary seeks to crystallize in a definition. The word "dog," for example, may be defined conceptually with reference to what all dogs have in common. Secondly, many words have imagistic associations; those of us who have a visual memory will tend to form an image of a dog when the word "dog" is spoken. And, thirdly, many words have acquired emotional and conative overtones; the word "dog" tends to arouse in some of us pleasurable emotions and attitudes because our experience with dogs has been fortunate, in others, feelings of repugnance or fear.

This threefold analysis of the meaning of words makes possible a sharp distinction between the ways in which poets and scientists use words. The scientist ignores the musical potentialities of the spoken word; for him these sounds are *merely* symbolic marks or tokens. He also does his best to strip the words he uses of their emotive and conative associations, and either to suppress their associated images or else rigorously to control them by translat-

ing them into scientifically accurate thought models. In short, the ideal linguistic medium of science consists of words which, singly and in combination, have a clear and unambiguous conceptual meaning and which arouse no scientifically irrelevant images, emotions, or volitional attitudes. The poet, in contrast, exploits the rich expressive potentialities of language to the fullest possible extent. His choice of words is dictated in part by strictly musical considerations; he knows how expressive of emotion is the mere sound and rhythm of the spoken word. He is also unusually sensitive to the emotive and conative overtones of words, and constantly enriches his pattern of meaning by the use of words heavily laden with such overtones. And, finally, by a flexible and incessant use of metaphor, he fuses images and concepts into significant and concrete wholes. The metaphor is his most powerful expressive device; for by means of it he is able to combine conceptual universality and imagistic vividness and immediacy. A sheer image, taken alone, lacks all significance; a concept by itself is cold, impersonal, and unreal. In happy combination, the virtues of each are preserved and the limitations of each are overcome; the concept saves the image from meaningless particularity and endows it with more universal significance, while the image clothes the conceptual skeleton with flesh and blood and helps to bring home to us with imaginative warmth and presentational immediacy truths only partly comprehended in cold conceptual analysis.

By this use of language the creative writer is able to present to us the world of physical objects and the realm of man's inner experience as the scientist cannot and should not attempt to do. Like the sculptor and the painter, the poet reveals to us the individuality of things more clearly than it is revealed to ordinary perception; he also, like them, embodies his intuitions of reality's more universal regularities and meanings in concrete imagery—he makes us apprehend these universals not abstractly, as does the scientist, but concretely. Hence the warmth, immediacy, and poignancy of a pictorial or literary portrait as contrasted with the cold, abstract aloofness of an X-ray photograph or a physiological analysis. This does not, of course, diminish in the least the peculiar value, both theoretical and practical, of science. Our sole concern is to urge that literature, like the other arts, has its own peculiar powers of expression. It can express what cannot be expressed in any other way; hence the impossibility of adequate translation of genuine literature—hence also the impossibility of restating in cold prose the unique and precious content of poetic utterance.

How, then, may we summarize the essential nature of art? Its most outstanding characteristic is its "incarnational" character. In each of the arts, though in very different ways, inner experience and spiritual insight are given concrete sensuous embodiment. Here matter and spirit meet; here matter becomes spiritually illumined and takes on spiritual meaning, while spirit becomes flesh and reveals itself to the imagination in sensuous form. To say that art is in essence "incarnational" is but to say that significant art is not an end in itself but rather an invaluable means to a higher end. Pure aesthetic delight is of course intrinsically satisfying, and beauty is a value not to be identified with or reduced to other values. In this sense art is indeed self-sufficient and self-contained; this is the element of truth in the doctrine of "art for art's sake." Significant art, however, exists not only for its own sake but for life's sake, and its significance for man consists not only in its ability to yield him aesthetic enjoyment but also, and more essentially, in its peculiar revelation to him of a reality *beyond itself*. It is to Hegel's everlasting credit that he so clearly appreciated the cognitive significance of art. He realized that art at its best is a unique expression of the values which reveal themselves to the spirit. For art is not only, as Aristotle taught, more serious and philosophical than history; it is, by virtue of its "incarnational" character, a fusion of history and philosophy, of temporal process and eternal essence, of sensuous fact and spiritual value. True art is a *way* to reality, a sensuous embodiment of *truth*.

The processes of artistic creation and aesthetic re-creation also point to the "incarnational" character of art. For both processes engage all of a man's faculties in more than usual harmony. The intuition of the artist is neither merely sensuous, nor imaginative, nor contemplative, nor volitional—it is all of these in close organic fusion. Similarly, adequate aesthetic response to a work of art is a response of the *whole man*, a response in which what is thought is also sensed and imagined, and what is apprehended by the mind is more truly apprehended because it is also felt. Art cannot rival science in conceptual clarity or precision. But art has its own clarity, its own coherence, and its own logic; obedient to the peculiar laws of its medium, it can and does reveal to us the world of fact and value in a way in which it cannot be revealed by scientific theory.

The Place of Art in Christian Worship

To what extent has this analysis of art substantiated our central thesis

that art is the only adequate vehicle for Christian worship? True worship, we insisted, is a response of the whole man to God. And such response, we urged, must have some vehicle. Our thoughts must be directed, our wills controlled, our emotions disciplined, if we are to do our part in the act of religious communion. Is it not clear that the several arts, taken in conjunction, and properly subordinated to this high purpose, are ideally suited to offer the necessary direction and control? They too, as we have seen, evoke the response of the whole man; they speak to his senses, stimulate his imagination, arouse his emotions, and engage his powers of reflection, and in so doing they tend to generate in him appropriate conative attitudes. We have also urged that all great art is not an end in itself but a way to reality. If this is true, religious art, or better, art suited to the necessities of religious worship, is a way to God. For in such art God's nature and God's relation to man can be made manifest not merely to the intellect, as in theological discourse, not merely to the will, as in moral exhortation, but to the heart—to feeling, will, and thought in fruitful harmony.

This applies, I believe, to all religious worship, public or private, pagan or Christian, but it applies particularly to *corporate* worship in the *Christian* tradition. If worship is to be corporate in any real sense the worshipers must be somehow united in a common approach to the Deity. Their mere presence in the same building at the same hour, however, is not enough to achieve this union. They need a common and expressive vehicle of worship, a language suited to the expression of their common needs and aspirations. The Christian church has proved repeatedly that the arts, wisely used, provide the desired vehicle. The Church of Rome, the Orthodox Greek Church and, in its own way, the Anglican Communion, have all richly exploited the religiously expressive potentialities of the several arts. Architecture, sculpture and painting, music, pantomime and poetry, have all been invoked to arouse a corporate sense of reverence, penitence, and forgiveness, of hope and joy, culminating in adoration. Witness, for example, the splendid use made in an Anglican service, conducted in an appropriate setting, of religiously expressive architecture, music, and stained glass, of symbolic objects on the altar and symbolic movements of the priest, and, above all, of the superb religious poetry of the Bible and the prayerbook. Other denominations, the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, for example, and more particularly the Quakers, have preferred a simpler service in a simpler setting; and not infrequently these forms have proved to be more expressive

of certain aspects of our Christian faith than more elaborate forms. But just as Catholic ritual has too often degenerated into idolatry and superstition, the Protestant revolt has too often sought to repudiate religiously expressive instruments and has made a virtue of austerity and ugliness. I offer no defense for garish and pretentious art unwisely pressed into the service of religion; in religion as elsewhere art has often been abused and its nature and function misconceived. These mistakes, however, must not be made to justify the substitution of theological disquisition or social exhortation for religiously expressive ritual. Once and for all, the primary function of religious worship is *worship*; whatever genuinely promotes such worship is thereby justified, whatever hinders the attainment of this end thereby stands condemned. And surely it cannot be denied that the arts have been used effectively, and should be so used, in corporate Christian worship.

But what of private worship? Communion with God is ultimately a transaction between God and each individual soul; and just as religion centers in worship, so worship must ultimately culminate in private communion and adoration. Would it not be perverse to insist on the need for artistic expressiveness in private prayer? The firm belief that God will do for us far more than we can ask or think, and that the most inadequate prayer, sincerely uttered, is of more avail than gorgeous pomp and ceremony, is an essential and precious part of our Christian heritage. God's willingness and ability to supplement our deficiencies, however, is again no excuse for lack of considered effort on our part or lack of institutional assistance. When His disciples said to Jesus, "Lord, teach us to pray," He recognized the legitimacy of their request and gave them for their use, and ours, the world's most perfect prayer. He realized that man does not know how to pray, that he needs to be helped and guided in his approach to Deity. One of the great duties of a church is to provide its members with vehicles for worship, even for private worship.

Every religion has indeed, in its own way, recognized the need for appropriate religious instruments; in Christianity the use of such vehicles is peculiarly needful and appropriate. For Christianity is in very essence incarnational;³ the doctrine of the Incarnation lies at the very center of the

³ The "incarnational" character of all art differs, of course, from the Incarnational character of Christianity. In Christ the personality of God is asserted to be uniquely Incarnate, whereas, in art, all sorts of spiritual experiences and values can find sensuous embodiment. In both cases, however, the super-sensible "is made flesh"; and it is just because art is incarnational in its own way that it provides so perfect a vehicle for the apprehension in Christian worship of the Divine Incarnation.

Christian faith. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Is not the artistry of the Christian service, culminating in the rite of the Lord's Supper, the perfect expression of this Divine Event? The Gospels tell us that Christ Himself instituted this dramatic rite; and since that evening meal the Church has rightly celebrated the coming of God to earth by continual expressive re-enactment of this ceremony. "The Sacrament is appointed," said Robert Bruce, "that we may get a better grip of Christ nor we get in the simple word."⁴ Whatever be our denominational interpretation of this Christian ceremony, we must surely grant its special appropriateness in the worship of the Christian God.

The dangers of religious ritual are much too obvious to need discussion. Nothing which allows of effective use is safe from abuse, and potential harm is proportionate to potential good. Honest defenders of religious instruments will be the first to urge the ever-present tendency of ritual to transform itself into mechanical and superstitious hocus-pocus, and of man's constant impulse to transform religious images into idols. The dangers of aestheticism are even greater, just because beauty is itself so intrinsically good and satisfying. None of these dangers, however, justifies a wholesale condemnation of religious forms and artifices. In the words of Doctor Will, "Certainly form without spirit is dead, but spirit without form is not capable of living."⁵ It has been our main concern to urge the recognition of this truth.

Yet even the most expressive vehicle for religious worship must finally be left behind. For true worship culminates in silence; man, having done his part, must quietly wait for God to speak. "Be still, and know that I am God." Such knowledge is the end and climax of all successful worship. It is a moment of mysticism, but of positive mysticism in which sense and imagination, will and reason are not denied but for an instant transcended. It is the function of art to prepare us for this mystic union, to lead us into the Divine Presence; having accomplished its task, it must, creaturely vehicle that it is, give way to the "still small voice" of Deity.

⁴ Quoted by E. R. Micklem, *Our Approach to God*, p. 268.

⁵ *Le Culte*, vol. II, p. 31, quoted by Micklem, *op. cit.*

The Cure of Souls

JOHN SUTHERLAND BONNELL

THE primary significance of the cure of souls is the "cura" or charge in which Christian ministers accept responsibility under God for the guardianship of the souls entrusted to them.

For the modern-day minister, located in one of our large cosmopolitan cities, the problem of the pastoral leadership of his people is tremendously complicated. He has difficulty in finding his parishioners at home because of the multitude of social, intellectual, and aesthetic pursuits in which people are engaged today. They are spending an ever-diminishing amount of time within the home. If at home they may be entertaining guests at bridge and the minister has difficulty in making them all glad he came. And even if no outsiders are present, he soon discovers that the atmosphere of the modern living room is not conducive to an intimate conversation which is spiritually helpful.

Many ministers waste their time and energy in making calls without seeing their parishioners. As a result, some call only on those to whom they have telephoned to make a definite appointment. Others conserve their time and energy even more by requesting their parishioners to come to the study in the church. This arrangement is usually found to be more satisfactory both to the ministers and their parishioners.

Any minister who undertakes to meet his people on more than a pleasant social basis will soon learn that their conversation will shortly reveal his parishioners' inner needs. He will find himself coming to close grips with human life. A New York surgeon said to me recently, "Tens of thousands of people visit clinics of hospitals and offices of physicians in this city every day seeking a remedy for physical ills. There are as many tens of thousands of sick souls in the city who do not come to us medical men for we don't give them what they need. You clergymen should be constantly at work ministering to them, even to those whose bodies we treat mechanically."

The suggestion of the surgeon that we ministers have an office to fulfill even with relation to sick bodies is emphasized also by Hawthorne in *The Scarlet Letter*. "A bodily disease which we look upon as whole and entire

within itself may, after all, be but a symptom of some ailment in the spiritual part." The reverse of this is also true, as Lucretius says,

"For when the body's sick and ill at ease
The mind doth often share in the disease."

It would appear, therefore, that there is a vast area to which our ministry ought to be directed and in which, up to the present, we have attempted little.

The pressure of clamant human needs has driven a great many ministers to the study of psychology and psychiatry but, if the interest on the part of Christian ministers in these new sciences will result only in transforming pastors into fourth-rate psychiatrists, then we shall be guilty of making nuisances of ourselves and of doing ineffectually what scientifically-trained men can do far better. We must always remember and never dare to forget that we are ambassadors of Christ entrusted with a ministry to the spirit as well as to the mind and body—a ministry which, therefore, goes beyond the practice of the psychiatrist or the physician. While this be true, we should endeavor to keep abreast of the constantly expanding knowledge of the human mind and its working, so that we may carry on this ministry with greater efficiency and less expenditure of time and energy.

One occasionally meets clergymen who are quite contemptuous of psychiatry. But that is not an unfamiliar phenomenon. There are ministers who are equally contemptuous of Biblical criticism, and who declare with scorn that it has nothing to add to the effectiveness of the minister's message. In both cases one cannot fail to note that the extent of the preacher's appreciation is a directly proportionate measure of his knowledge of the issues involved.

Some ministers, in this matter of personal relationships, are born psychologists but even they have something to learn from the experts in this field. I recall a conversation which I had a year or two ago with one of the most skillful deep-sea fishermen I have known. There was very little about the habits of the fish which he did not understand. I was impressed, however, as he told me of a lecture to which he had listened, delivered by a professor of marine biology. "Well," said the fisherman, "I've always been a practical man and have had great contempt for talk, especially on this subject of fishin'. That's been the business of me family for generations. But, on the night on which I listened to that professor fellow talk, he told us

the reason why we do what we do. Now I'm a better fisherman and I can answer questions too, as well as catch fish, for I'm using me head as well as me arms and legs."

So, likewise, the minister who values his time and desires to conserve his mental and spiritual resources will inform himself of the teaching of these sciences that deal with the human mind.

Whenever the subject of personal interviewing is mentioned in the presence of ministers, someone is almost sure to say, "I should rejoice in this type of work, but I am not fitted for it. Nobody ever comes to me with their problems." The real tragedy is that all ministers have the opportunity to deal faithfully with individual lives in their congregation but, unfortunately, many of us are not aware of it. Ask the minister who is doubtful about his own effectiveness in this work, "Who visited your study yesterday and the day before?" He will reply, "Several people came in, but they did not come to talk about religion. They came to confer with me on other matters."

Here is a typical illustration of what may happen to any minister who is alert to human need.

I looked at the card which a secretary had just laid on my desk. The name read: Mr. Eric Randson. The time had come for my first interview that morning. I knew that the man, whose name had been given to me, was waiting in the consulting room adjoining my study.

As I entered this room, a young man about twenty-one years of age rose to greet me. He was tall, dark, and well dressed, with an alert expression.

"I'm sorry," he said, "but I fear that I have come to you under false colors. I am a reporter. I haven't come for help on a personal problem. Instead I wish to interview you for my paper."

The young man explained that he had already interviewed four other ministers of the larger churches in Manhattan. He asked me a series of questions about my work, the consulting room, and the types of persons who came to me for spiritual help. Having written down my answers and his general impressions during the interview, he folded up his notebook, thanked me, and rose to take his coat and hat.

I said, "Just a moment, please. Are you in a great hurry?"

He looked at me a little surprised and replied, "Why, no, but I don't want to take up your time."

"Do you like reporting?" I asked him.

"Yes," he said, "I'm never happier than when I am on the job."

"Then I take it that you *are* happy," I responded, "but are you really happy within?"

For a moment he lowered his head and then replied, "I've interviewed many men and women before this, and lots of ministers, but nobody ever asked me how things go inside me. I've never had anyone interested in me in all my life. May I talk to you and tell you what's been troubling me?"

Forthwith he launched into one of the most heart-breaking stories to which I have ever listened—a story that haunted me for weeks afterward. In that consulting room, this young man found God and discovered, also, the answer to a problem which he had believed to be beyond solution.

In my interview files there is a letter from Mr. Randson which I shall always prize. In it he says, "My visit to your study marked a new beginning in my life. The victory has been complete and I have won it on the old battleground where before I had always met defeat. Now I know what Paul meant when he said, 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.'"

When a minister conducts an interview with a stranger, or even with someone he has known a long time in a social way, but never before in the privacy of a study, several principles should be borne in mind.

First: Very few people, whether parishioners or strangers, who come in to talk to the minister, state frankly and clearly at the outset the real purpose of the visit.

A visitor, beginning with a narrative of trouble, may go on to ask help for others than himself or to protest against what others are doing, to ask advice on some problem not directly related to religion, and lastly, though by no means infrequently, to obtain spiritual help. Sometimes during a whole initial interview he will not tell anything that is of vital importance to the solution of his problem. He comes really to form his estimate of the minister before he tells his story, to decide whether this clergyman is the one who should hear it.

A psychiatrist, practicing in New York, told me one day, "A patient coming for the first time to consult me fills up the entire first hour with data that, important and true as they are, are not vital to the problem. He has to assure himself not by asking directly, but by seeing me, that I understand his kind of a case, that I am not going to disapprove of his behavior, whether normal or abnormal, and that I will keep his communications confidential."

So is it with the minister in his study. For instance, a young man, twenty-one years of age, came to me. The question he proposed was this: Should he undertake a course in Arts or should he take a course in business training? This was the subject of his discourse during the first hour. I discovered a little later, however, that the real question which he wished answered was whether or not he should *take his own life*. I am quite sure that, when he came to me, he did not intend to disclose the major problem that was troubling him. But deep down in his subconscious mind there was the hope that somehow the minister might be able to help him with this underlying problem, even if he should talk only about the one that was on the surface.

Sometimes it will require two, three, or even many more interviews to get at the root of the trouble, but we must be prepared to consecrate our time to this all-important work. The tragic fact is that thousands of people go in and out of ministers' studies all over this land, without having the deep and unspoken needs of their lives ministered to. It is a safe presumption that all the men and women who come to us are in need of spiritual inspiration and help.

Second: Listen patiently to the parishioner who has come to talk with you.

Do not interrupt his story. Silence is golden, especially when someone is unloading his heart to you. Here again we ministers can learn from the psychiatrists. They sometimes listen to their patients by the hour, the only interruption being an occasional question or a mere gesture by the doctor.

It is at this point that most ministers fail in interviewing. They are over-anxious to give advice to people. They want to preach to them, to tell them about God and prayer. There will be a time, of course, for these important considerations, but they should not be intruded before the whole story has been told or before the inquirer is ready to accept help. The first rule for the successful conduct of an interview is—listen. The second is—listen. The third is—listen. Always be on the alert to catch word or phrase that may be a clue to the hidden problem. Try to see and understand the personality behind the explanations and evasions to which you are listening.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, in *Elsie Venner*, says:

"The doctor knew the difference between what men say and what they mean, as well as most people. When he was listening to common talk, he was in the habit of

looking over his spectacles; if he lifted his head so as to look through them at the person talking, he was busier with that person's thoughts than with his words."

The minister, too, must learn to see, behind the parishioner's words, his underlying thoughts and motives.

Oftentimes the most urgent need of those who come to us is to find a sympathetic listener. When the surcharged heart has emptied itself of a heavy burden, a long step has already been taken toward complete deliverance and healing.

Nathaniel Hawthorne, in *The Scarlet Letter*, makes the clergyman Dimmesdale say to the physician:

"Many, many a poor soul hath given its confidence to me, not only on the death-bed, but while strong in life, and fair in reputation. And ever, after such an outpouring, oh what a relief have I witnessed in those sinful brethren! even as in one who at last draws free air after long stifling with his own polluted breath. How can it be otherwise?"

It must be remembered, of course, that the relief which comes from confession is not necessarily release from sin. The minister's main contribution will be made following the confession rather than in eliciting it. The minister must be able to show to the penitent how the acceptance of God's forgiveness and the honest resolve to lead a new life will produce a complete transformation of character.

Dr. C. G. Jung, of Switzerland, in his book *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* states his conviction that the Protestant minister of today stands, at this point, on the verge of a vast horizon of effective service, but seems not to have noticed it.

Third: No clergyman can adequately minister to the deepest needs in human hearts who has not learned to deal effectually with his own.

Most psychiatrists, who are actively engaged in the practice of their profession, have at some time submitted to psychoanalysis. Many of them have traveled halfway round the world and spent even two or three years to obtain this experience, after they have had their intramural medical, general hospital and mental hospital training.

Lying on a couch in the doctor's office, with every muscle relaxed, the candidate to become a psychiatrist has talked hours at a time about himself from memories of his earliest childhood, his aspirations, his hopes, his fears, his dreams, especially those which have recurred at frequent intervals. In

fact, he has sought to empty the contents of his mind in the hearing of the psychiatrist. And when the process was completed he listened to an expert analysis, in which his character was laid bare in every intimate detail before his eyes.

Psychoanalysis is oftentimes a depressing and deflating experience. But frequently a man who is to devote his life to the work of psychiatry feels it necessary to submit to this experience that he may understand himself thoroughly—his own motives and desires and impulses—and that he may deal more effectively with the problems of his patients.

Ministers, on the other hand, graduate from their seminaries and undertake the responsibility of directing the work of a church, without having had much, if any, inquiry into their habits of personal devotion and, in particular, into their own ways of sinning.

I am convinced that one of the reasons why ministers oftentimes fail at this point is because they have so little understanding of themselves. I do not recommend that a minister should be psychoanalyzed just for training in the ministry. Indeed, I seriously question the wisdom of such a step. Nor do I recommend, of course, that all knowledge gained by psychoanalysis should be avoided by ministers. I do think that, at whatsoever cost, in so far as he is able to do so he should carry out the injunction of Solon of Athens: "Know thyself."

One of the ways in which this knowledge may be achieved is for the minister to sit down with a brother minister whom he both loves and trusts and who both loves and trusts him in spite of anything he may have to say, and there, in the presence of God, unveil his own heart. His friend will help him to discover those areas of his life that need to be surrendered to the will and power of God. Herein lies one of the differentiating techniques—a minister, not a psychiatrist, admits God into the problems at hand. If this self-examination is performed earnestly, thoroughly, prayerfully, it will produce marked results in a deeper consecration. It will open the minister's eyes to hidden weaknesses in his own life, of which he was unaware. The Rig Veda, a Hindu Scripture, contains an apt observation on this point:

"Men soon the faults of others learn.

A few their virtues too, find out.

But is there one—I have a doubt,

Who can his own defects discern?"

How can a minister detect the hidden resentment buried deep in the life of

an inquirer unless, first of all, he has learned to recognize this insidious sin in his own heart?

The same truth holds good in the case of fears, jealousies, obsessions of inferiority or superiority, marital problems and tensions, morbid thoughts, undisciplined desires, and the thousand other ills that afflict mankind. The minister who deals superficially with his own weaknesses is bound to deal inadequately with the frailties of others.

If a minister has never known the release and joy that comes from a full confession of sin and the acceptance of God's forgiveness, how can he lead burdened souls into such a cleansing experience?

As a matter of fact, however, confession to God alone is sometimes used as an escape from facing the reality of wrongdoing. Undoubtedly there are many people, especially among earnest and well-instructed Protestants, who, in private prayer to God and in secret confession of sin, gain the full assurance of His forgiveness and the power to lead a new and better life. But it is equally true that there are multitudes of others who will be best helped by having a witness to this transaction between the soul and God.

In my own experience I have discovered that penitents will find it much easier to make a clean break with the sins of the past if they have undergone the humiliating experience of permitting me to know the wrongs which they have done. Recently I came upon an enlightening comment upon this point from a most unlooked-for source. Seneca, in one of his epistles, says,

"It is a true saying which I have found in Athenodorus: 'Know that thou art freed from all desires when thou hast reached such a point that thou prayest to God for nothing except what thou canst pray for openly.' But how foolish men are now! They whisper the basest of prayers to heaven; but if anyone listens, they are silent at once. That which they are unwilling for men to know, they communicate to God."

The Roman philosopher was keenly aware of the effect which is produced upon ourselves when we know that our inner life is exposed to the view of a fellow creature.

The minister who is constantly called upon to listen to the confidences and confessions of men and women will not lack an understanding of the human heart. It is at this point where many ministers fail. A great deal of modern preaching lacks vitality and effectiveness because it does not reach men and women at the plane on which they live. In other words, the

preacher is not conversant with their inner aspirations, their failures, their temptations, their weaknesses, their sins.

In a preface to a volume of sermons by the Rev. F. W. Robertson of Brighton, there occur these words written by an observant layman:

"Many are miserable in their inmost hearts, who are light-hearted and gay before the world. They feel that no heart understands theirs, or can help them. Now, suppose the preacher goes down into the depths of his own being, and has the courage and fidelity to carry all he finds there, first to God in confession and prayer, and then to his flock as some part of the general experience of Humanity, do you not feel that he must be touching close upon some brother-man's sorrows and wants?"

All this is just as true of personal interviewing as it is of preaching except that, in the case of the interview, the minister must have a still deeper knowledge of the human heart and to possess that knowledge he must have learned, first of all, to know his own.

Matthew Arnold said of Goethe that he was able to lay his finger, with unerring accuracy, upon the real seat of human misery and ill, and say "Thou ailest here and here." Whether or not that be true of Goethe, certainly it was true of Jesus Christ. The Evangelist John says,

"He knew all men and needed not that any should testify of man, for he knew what was in man."

During an interview with Nicodemus, Jesus laid His finger unerringly upon this Pharisee's complacency and spiritual pride. In the case of the young ruler the Master pointed to his possessions, around which his heart was entwined. In the home of Zaccheus Jesus revealed to the tax-gatherer his dishonesty, his greed and his bitter resentment against the hate of his fellow citizens. Sitting by the well of Sychar, He placed His finger unerringly upon the moral problem in the life of a Samaritan woman. "He knew what was in man." He possessed the power of bringing people face to face with their real self. And He expects those who are His followers to exercise a like ministry.

All our relationships with others, in personal interviews, will demand penetrating insight into human hearts and minds. We must remember, of course, the words of Dwight L. Moody:

"No man can lead others nearer to Christ than he is living himself."

It will avail us little if we can bring to needy lives only a second-hand experience of Christ, if we are compelled to go back to the Acts of the Apos-

ties for evidences of God's power in human lives. We need a contemporary Christian experience. We ministers must reserve a portion of every day for self-examination and communion with God. The unfailing result of this spiritual discipline will be an inner serenity and poise, a quietness and confidence which will enable us to minister effectively to the fevered and disoriented lives that come to us for hope and healing.

Fourth: Every confidence entrusted to us in personal interviews must be kept inviolate.

In the Roman Catholic Church adequate provision has been made on this point. The canon law says:

"The priest who breaks the seal of the confessional remains under ex-communication. This law admits of no exception."

So binding is the confessional vow upon a priest that he will not speak to a penitent, outside of the confessional, upon the subject of matters which he has confessed, unless that individual has first given him permission to do so. Neither by word, nor by sign, will he betray a confidence given to him.

Unfortunately the same thing cannot be said of Protestants. That is especially true, in recent years, of religious movements that have emerged. Sometimes in ordinary conversation and in public addresses confidences are shockingly betrayed. No minister or Protestant layman should reveal in a public meeting, in personal talk, or in any printed form, a confidence entrusted to him by some burdened soul who has come to him for help.

There are, of course, occasions when one person's problem may be identical with that of many others, and the recital of how one individual has found release may be an inestimable blessing to a multitude of people. Whenever this is done, however, scrupulous care must be observed, that the identity of the individual concerned can never, by any possibility, be discovered. In some instances, so salutary may be the lessons to be gained from one penitent's experience that his permission may be obtained to use the salient facts of his case in the service of other needy lives.

The necessity of keeping every confidence entrusted to us is especially incumbent upon ministers. Our ordination vow should, in itself, be a guarantee that no trust will ever be betrayed.

In an article recently written in *The Christian Century*, on the subject "Betraying the Confessional," Frances J. Nickels says:

"Not long ago I was in a city, a stranger. When Sunday came I sought as usual

a church where I might worship. The young minister preached a stirring sermon to inspire a sense of responsibility toward the social order. To illustrate his point he told the story of a man he called his 'unnamed friend'—how the friend had come to him in strictest confidence with a problem of great importance in connection with a certain welfare project. He wanted to talk over with him a large gift that he wished to make for its support and which he preferred to be anonymous. As the preacher developed his illustration point by point, I recognized the man he portrayed as one of my friends, a modest, reserved person who would be outraged to have himself and his benefactions thus discussed, even though he was held up as a shining example. He is the sort of man who would not want even his left hand to know what his right was doing, and here he was being shown off as Exhibit A! The service ended, the minister in friendly fashion waited at the door to greet the congregation. Having introduced myself, and assured that no one else could overhear, I remarked, "That was a fine tribute you paid to Mr. A."

"Surprised, he said laughingly, 'Why, did you recognize him from my description?'

" 'Indeed, with so vivid a portrayal I do not see how anyone could fail to do so,' I replied.

" 'How fortunate,' he responded, 'that I said only good of him. It would have been all the same if I had criticized him, wouldn't it? It shows how careful one should be in talking of his friends in public.'

"I wanted to say, 'I know that if he could have listened in today he would have felt that his confidence had been flagrantly betrayed.' Perhaps I shirked a true responsibility."

Such a breach of confidence is almost unbelievable and altogether without excuse. I am quite sure this case is not at all representative of the Protestant ministry as a whole; that it is in truth a rare exception. Few people would come to us with their confidences if they suspected that the subject matter of their confessions would promptly be relayed to the public in sermons, in conversations, or through the press.

It is a striking fact that the courts of law in this nation are beginning to recognize that a Protestant minister has the right to keep inviolate the confessions that are entrusted to him.

A case in point occurred during the year 1931, in Minnesota. The Rev. Emil Swenson was commanded by the Hennepin County District Court to reveal, in a suit for divorce, information that had been given to him by a parishioner seeking spiritual counsel. The Rev. Mr. Swenson refused to give testimony. He was found guilty by the presiding magistrate and sentenced to a fine of one hundred dollars or thirty days in jail. The Supreme Court of Minnesota, however, reversed this ruling and freed the minister. Meanwhile the Minnesota legislature has taken steps to

remove any ambiguity in the former law and to make clear the right of all Protestant ministers to refuse to divulge information contained in confessions made to them.

Every medical doctor, on his graduation, takes the Hippocratic oath in which he pledges himself not only to keep inviolate all information that has come to him in the course of his practice, but also to refrain from gossip. The section of the oath which deals with these matters reads as follows:

"And whatever I see or hear in the course of my profession, as well as outside my profession in my intercourse with men, if it be what should not be published abroad, I will never divulge, holding such things to be holy secrets."

My experience would indicate that this section of the Hippocratic oath is conscientiously observed by physicians in general, though there are always a few doctors, as there are some ministers, who forget their obligations. In both cases, however, these are the exception rather than the rule.

Not even a thorough understanding of modern psychiatry, or faithful attendance at mental case clinics, can ever replace, in the life and work of a minister, an experimental knowledge of what God can do for a man. Oftentimes we shall be called upon to rekindle faith in hearts where its flame has flickered and gone out. We shall need to teach people how to pray, how to read the Bible so that its message may have a definite and personal application to their inner needs, how to enter into a fellowship with God so intimate and real that life shall become an unbroken pilgrimage with Him.

It will not be the task of ministers, as some have recently assumed, to make our religion more psychological. Our responsibility will be fulfilled only as we make our psychology more religious and employ it effectively in the service of God and of the human soul.

Whither Chemists?

WEBSTER N. JONES

"To a job we love we rise betime
And go to it with delight."

A QUARTER of a century ago, it was my good fortune to study under Professor Theodore William Richards—that great scientist, teacher, scholar, Nobel Laureate, and humanist so well known to all of you. In a conference with him, I expressed a desire to enter the teaching profession. In his usual gracious manner he informed me that the financial outlook in teaching was not as promising as that of business; that if I entered the profession of teaching, I need not expect to own a mansion, works of art, a valuable private library, or even an automobile—automobiles were much more expensive then than they are now. "However," he counseled, "teaching will make possible the continuance of your investigations with freedom and the opportunity to inspire others in the study of chemistry and in the building of character."

The advice which he gave me rings as true today as it did twenty-five years ago, or as it ever did.

I consider students in our colleges today a select group. Perhaps you do not realize just how select you are. You have weathered grade school and high school, and your scholastic records in high school were of such worth that you were considered suitable material for admission to college. Statistics, if I may be permitted to stand on that treacherous ground, show that only fifty per cent of the children who enter the first grade complete grade school; fifty per cent of the young people who graduate from grade school complete high school; thirty-five per cent of the high-school graduates matriculate in college; and sixty-five per cent of those who enter college complete the work necessary for graduation. It must be apparent that your comparative educational status has been greatly improved during the past fifteen years. You have gone ahead, while ninety-five per cent of those who started with you have been compelled to take less favored courses. Because of your gifts and good fortune, your responsibility to the science of chemistry and to humanity has been increased in like proportion—even beyond that, to a degree that you cannot now fully realize.

I believe, however, that you should realize this responsibility in part. No doubt you do, for a portion of it is scholarship, and you certainly must know its significance. Scholarship is very essential to success, for it gives evidence of the interest and capabilities of the student. Contrary to popular opinion, based on rare exceptions, a student who excels in scholarship is more apt to be successful in later life than one who does not take scholarship seriously. "Everyone, doubtless, knows a few brilliantly successful individuals who, as college students, were habitually on the ragged edge of dismissal, and who finally squeezed out a diploma more or less through sufferance of their professors. Conversely, some cases lead us to believe that brilliant students are more than likely to fail in the arena of practical life. However, a two-year research by Hugh A. Smith into the records of 1,800 men who graduated from the University of Wisconsin between 1890 and 1920 appears to explode these views convincingly. His findings show an agreement as to degree of success in college studies and in subsequent worldly activities that is almost unbelievable. Perhaps the most striking thing revealed is this: from the 1,800 men, 95 were selected as having become 'the most worthy, successful or eminent.' Another list was prepared of the 95 who as students had attained the highest average grades. On comparison, it was found that 87 men were on both lists! With respect to engineers, one may be inclined to think that the correspondence between college success and future success is probably greater than in business or in most other professions. In any event, the facts revealed by Doctor Smith should be a source of comfort to science and engineering students who, on occasion, may feel that their studies are a bit too arduous, and that good marks are not indispensable to later success."

My past experience tells me that college students may be divided into three classes. First are those who have decided on the work in chemistry they want to do. They have known from the first what they wanted and where their opportunities lay. Perhaps they were previously in industry, realized their limitations, corrected them in college, and are now going back. Let me illustrate. A senior at Carnegie knew what he wanted; he had his heart set on a job with duPont. After some negotiations, he received a wire asking him to report for an interview in Wilmington. It was at the beginning of the Pittsburgh flood, and he telephoned me apologetically at midnight for advice. Trains were not running, but he said that by taking a plane to New York, he could reach Wilmington in time for the appointment. When

I said, "Go," he replied, "That is what I wanted you to say." He made the trip, and the interview was successful. He began work on July 1 as an explosives chemist. I know that there are students present, though few in number, who, like him, have their hearts set on a particular job.

To the second class belong those who have been assigned to the study of chemistry. They are the sons of explosives, dye, perfume, soap, food, or rubber manufacturers; their positions are awaiting them. They are preparing to replace a parent or a chemical director. These students are fortunate, but few.

The third class is composed of those who are in doubt as to the type of chemical work they wish to undertake. I appreciate the difficult position of a senior when he is fortunate or unfortunate enough to receive several offers from industrial concerns as a result of interviews. A few days ago I was consulted by a senior who was struggling to make a decision between two positions, one in the rubber industry, the other in the oil industry. Because of my long experience in rubber he felt that I was responsible for his offer from the Goodrich Rubber Company and that he was obligated in some indefinite way to me. I soon corrected that misapprehension. I am always wary of telling anyone what he should do, especially a senior. Accepting an obligation or a responsibility is an individual problem. At the same time, while I am making this statement, I realize that a straightforward request for advice should have a straightforward answer.

Chemistry offers excellent opportunities in two large fields of endeavor, the teaching of chemistry, and the application of chemistry in industry. Even now it is difficult for most of you to reach a decision as to whether your opportunities lie in teaching or in industry, whether your inclinations, aptitudes, and training best fit you for one activity or for the other. In order to make the decision seem less difficult, let us examine some of the easier aspects of the situation. My opinion is that students with a four-year college training in chemistry are qualified to make a living in laboratory positions in industry. But what is that? They are, in the jargon of the profession, "lab dogs." They should be warned that in industry they will meet keen competition from chemical engineers whose training has been pointed toward unit operations, rather than chemical analysis and fundamental research. On the other hand, students who have had the necessary courses in educational subjects can undertake the secondary-school teaching of chemistry. For those of you who have excelled in scholarship and desire to enter research or college teach-

ing, I strongly recommend that you continue your studies in a graduate school under a professor whose field of investigation especially appeals to you and who has a reputation for inspiring those who study under his direction. Graduate work is open to men of exceptional promise, and it certainly has its lure. The problem of financing graduate study is quite as difficult as making up your mind to do graduate study. In all of our universities, scholarships, fellowships, and teaching assistantships are open to those of unusual scholastic attainments and special aptitudes fitting them for graduate study. Those of you who have not excelled scholastically are not granted this opportunity. It would be well, too, for these latter students to weigh carefully the advisability of undertaking graduate work, even though they have financial support upon which to rely. The reason I am urging caution is that mediocre scholarship is often the result of the lack of interest, or of the dispersion of energy. Any student who is not definitely determined upon his future course or his future interest would do well to settle upon what it is to be before putting further time and money into a makeshift. The question for such a youth is not so much "Whither Chemists?" as it is "Whither Student?"

Let me return to our discussion of graduate study. There is considerable impatience among young men who are graduating from college. They are anxious to go to work, to do something productive, and it is difficult for them to see the desirability of continuing their studies. To young men of promise who have the financial backing, I usually tell the story of the training and experience of one of my close personal friends, Dr. E. K. Bolton, who devoted many years of his life to the acquisition of an education before he entered industry. After four years of undergraduate work at Bucknell University, he spent five years in graduate study at Harvard before he obtained a Ph.D. degree. It takes courage, stamina, perseverance, and foresight to devote so much additional time to graduate study in preparation for a hoped-for position of which, seemingly, there is no assurance. After he obtained a Ph.D., Doctor Bolton was awarded an Austin Traveling Fellowship and spent two additional years in Germany, studying under Willstätter. Within the first six weeks, he had isolated and determined the constitution of the red coloring matter in geraniums. When he returned to the United States, he was offered an instructorship in chemistry, which he declined in order to accept a position as chemist with the duPont Company. A dozen years later we find him Director of Research of this mammoth organization.

Another friend of mine, Dr. Roger Adams, received his early training in chemistry, pursued graduate work, studied abroad, and returned to become an instructor in organic chemistry at Harvard. He accepted a position with the University of Illinois. During the whole period of our friendship, I have marveled at the enthusiasm he has displayed toward the science of chemistry. During our college days he was ever talking chemical reactions, whether we were in a study room, on a hike, or attending a "pop" concert. In the "war to end all wars," he was a major in the Chemical Warfare Service and was responsible for "Adamsite," a sneeze gas. After the war he was advanced to the chairmanship of the department of chemistry at the University of Illinois. He has numerous contributions to his credit. As a result of his exceptional ability in chemistry, he was awarded the Willard Gibbs Medal in May, 1936. He is a past president of the American Chemical Society and a Nichols medalist.

I like to tell of a young man who was studying chemistry at Harvard University when I was a student there. As a senior he had started research work in organic chemistry under Professor Elmer Peter Kohler. He graduated with honors and was awarded a Phi Beta Kappa Key. His research work was in organic chemistry. After he received his Ph.D. degree, he worked in a chemical plant for one year. He then returned to Harvard as an instructor and was rapidly advanced in rank to assistant professor, associate professor, full professor, and ultimately chairman of the department of chemistry. When President Lowell retired, James Bryant Conant was selected for the presidency of the oldest American university.

While I was teaching at the University of Montana, a very able student solicited my advice as to whether he should specialize in physics or in chemistry. I suggested that he familiarize himself with both and devote his attention to the borderline problems. He pursued graduate work at the University of California, accepted an instructorship at Johns Hopkins University, and was later called to Columbia University. Seventeen years after he received his degree from the University of Montana, he was awarded the Nobel Prize for the discovery of "heavy water." Harold Urey's name is familiar to all of you.

You may think that these men are the exceptions; that they possess unusual qualifications, even genius; or that they are unusually lucky. It is my opinion that this is not quite the case. As students, they showed no more promise than many a student who faces me. What is more, the progress

of science has given you equal or better opportunities than they had. What do my illustrations mean? They signify that chemists of promise who desire to enter chemical research, or any other field of research, should not be content with a four-year undergraduate course. The broader the undergraduate course and the better the graduate training, the more probable is a man's success in research. Let me give you one example of the necessity for extensive preparation in research. In the rubber industry, the determination of the constitution of the rubber molecule, the preparation of synthetic plastics, the discovery of new adhesives, the economical selection and preparation of new materials for the vulcanization, acceleration, preservation, reinforcement, and loading of rubber, and the finding of new uses for a material that already is utilized in making more than thirty-five thousand different products, present problems which are a challenge to the best-trained and most ingenious minds. Is it not apparent that the better you are prepared, the better are your chances of succeeding?

Now, what about industry? What opportunities is it providing? With the return of better business, all of our institutions of higher learning are being visited by industrial scouts. Industry is searching for men of scholarship and training who are qualified to work in such fields as rubber, dye manufacture, heavy chemicals, explosives, pigments, resins, organic chemicals, sugar, paints, fuels, foods, and the like. Many training schools have been developed for the chemists and chemical engineers who are carefully selected from preferred colleges and universities—special recognition being invariably given to students doing graduate work. It is the policy of the companies to select the better-trained men from a large number of widely scattered institutions in order to avoid clannishness, to stimulate competition, and to profit from whatever differences there are in educational trends. Recent graduates are not usually required to have experience in the specific industry's technology. During a preliminary training period in any given plant, the college and university graduates are given manual work in the various production departments in order to become acquainted with production operations, methods, and costs. The men are supplied with handbooks, and time is set aside for talks by experienced men on the properties and uses of materials, physical testing, compounding, construction, materials control, engineering problems, costs, time study, sales, and research. When they return to the laboratory after this practical experience, they are better able to apply their chemical training to plant problems and, later, to select more intelligently the type of

work that they wish to do. As for co-operation, I know, to use an example from one industry, that the rubber companies have a generous attitude toward research, and a very friendly spirit exists among the many research workers of rival companies. The chemists and chemical engineers have not confined themselves to technical work alone but have branched out into every phase of this major industry. The presidents of two of the four large rubber companies are men who were trained in chemistry.

It has been interesting to observe the change in attitude of industry toward the chemist in recent years. In the depression of 1921 the first department to suffer in many industries was chemical research. The drastic curtailment of research at that time showed a short-sighted policy and ultimately resulted in almost irreparable economic losses. During the period from 1930 until 1936, management, as a rule, showed more consideration for technical men and made an effort to preserve research organizations. Management has come to the realization that research organizations are not built up in a day, that years are needed to select and train technical men, that research requires careful nurture, and that complete abandonment of research programs with the dismissal of highly trained men, on the plea of financial necessity, is provocative of economic waste and is one of the surest ways to economic oblivion. On the other side, research men of ability are wary of affiliating with a company which has an unstable research policy and which deals in wholesale slaughter of personnel during dark days of economic stress. Everyone is familiar with the fact that the chemical industries have withstood the depression very well. One of the primary reasons for this favorable outcome is the attitude of the industries toward, and financial support of, research. Chemical industries are now reaping their reward from a long-time investment in a department often unintelligently characterized as unproductive. You may be sure that industry will be ready for you when you are fully prepared.

I say "fully" advisedly, and I mean that while you are getting ready for your life's work, you should not neglect getting ready for life—to live. It would be unfortunate if your education were narrow—confined to specialization in one study—instead of being broad and liberal—embracing a variety of studies. The educational program in liberal arts permits of considerably more flexibility than that in the professional courses, such as engineering, medicine, and law. The Engineers' Council for Professional Development is devoting considerable attention to a survey of engineering colleges. If you

examine the curricula in any of our engineering colleges, you will find that very little opportunity is afforded the engineering student to select elective courses in which he has a healthy and consuming interest. I raise the question, "Should the course in chemistry be so standardized that little opportunity is left for a student of chemistry to select subjects of his own choosing?" My opinion is that a young man who studies chemistry, in addition to a broad training in his chosen field, should supplement the work with a thorough grounding in mathematics, physics, and English. The scientific literature of the present day gives evidence that the papers which are being published in our chemical journals involve, in their preparation, the use and clear understanding of mathematics and physics. And may I say in passing that no student can consider himself well informed in his chosen sphere of study unless he is familiar with the current happenings in it. In brief, he should read the technical journals. May I say further that for a full joy of living, such subjects as history, languages, economics, sociology, psychology, astronomy, biology, and philosophy are essential. How many of you men have had the good fortune to study all of the subjects that I have enumerated? I do not mean exhaustively, but at least with sufficient training to have your cultural outlook liberalized. Robert Louis Stevenson, in "An Apology for Idlers," has anathematized the product of the narrow and limited education of which I speak:

"There is a sort of dead-alive, hackneyed people about, who are scarcely conscious of living except in the exercise of some conventional occupation. Bring these fellows into the country, or set them aboard ship, and you will see how they pine for their desk or their study. They have no curiosity; they cannot give themselves over to random provocations; they do not take pleasure in the exercise of their faculties for its own sake; and unless Necessity lays about them with a stick, they will even stand still. It is no good speaking to such folk; they cannot be idle, their nature is not generous enough; and they pass those hours in a sort of coma, which are not dedicated to furious moiling in the goldmill. When they do not require to go to the office, when they are not hungry and have no mind to drink, the whole breathing world is a blank to them. If they have to wait an hour or so for a train, they fall into a stupid trance with their eyes open. To see them, you would suppose there was nothing to look at and no one to speak with; you would imagine they were paralyzed or alienated; and yet very possibly they are hard workers in their own way, and have good eyesight for a flaw in a

deed or a turn of the market. They have been to school and college, but all the time they had their eye on the medal; they have gone about in the world and mixed with clever people, but all the time they were thinking of their own affairs. As if a man's soul were not too small to begin with, they have dwarfed and narrowed theirs by a life of all work and no play; until here they are at forty, with a listless attention, a mind vacant of all material of amusement, and not one thought to rub against another, while they wait for the train."

While endeavoring to liberalize your culture, you should take care not to undertake an aimless mastery of all knowledge. Your efforts should be productive, creative. Knowledge has been expanded by such leaps and bounds that it is impossible for a man to make, like Francis Bacon, "all knowledge his province." I am reminded of an incident emanating from the apocrypha of President Eliot of Harvard. One evening, in his study, he picked up a Harvard catalog. After a cursory survey, he discovered, to his surprise, that if he were to spend sufficient time to take all the courses offered at Harvard, it would require one hundred eight years. Another story that I heard from President Eliot's lips is apropos of this discussion. He said that when Ralph Waldo Emerson was attending Harvard College, he took ninety per cent of the work that Emerson wanted to take and ten per cent of the work that Harvard wanted him to take. Apparently Emerson could not be content with mere indoctrination from above. He must follow his bent and explore some unknown. He must try his own creative impulses in some unmapped intellectual realm. Why? Because the experience is so convincingly satisfying. The qualification that pays the biggest dividend, whether it is in philosophy, science, law, or religion, is creative thought.

For you young chemists, I have been painting the pictures of opportunities that you will see in your quest for success. Before I leave, may I offer you a few words of homely advice, based on experience? When you enter a new community, let one of your first considerations be to attend church regularly. Do more; actively participate in its life. Become a member of a Sunday-school class, or a choir, or a social group under its auspices. All these activities will profit you immeasurably. They will give a satisfaction of spirit and soul that will have no limit. Not only that, they will be the means of being a steadying influence in your youthful inexperience in meeting life and its problems. Incidentally, in these affiliations you will find the alleviation of incipient homesickness and the way to fine and lasting friendships.

Purchase a life insurance policy, which will start you on the road to saving and assure those who have helped you of a return in case of misfortune. Attend all chemical meetings within the range of your pocketbook. Read the chemical literature in the field that you have chosen and as much more in fields of general culture as your time will permit. Cultivate the acquaintance and friendship of people who "have done things." Consciously strive to be individuals of character, breadth of interest, leadership, creative ability, and good companionship.

Thus far I have been discussing with you the materialistic phases of "Whither Chemists." There is a more important aspect—the spiritual—that we should not lose sight of in our quest for knowledge in our chosen science. There is a tendency for men of science to become so deeply engrossed in their work that they neglect to give the necessary attention to their spiritual growth and development. The teachings of the great Master in no way conflict with the knowledge of chemistry that I have acquired. As a matter of fact, the deeper I delve into science, the clearer is my understanding of God, His teachings, and His universe. It is my opinion that those who contribute to an advance in the science of chemistry are unfolding—and they should unfold—the inexhaustible complexities of the universe and are thus contributing to the revelation of the greatness of God to their fellow men. Should not our ambitions as chemists be to discover the hidden truths, with the objective in mind of benefiting not only mankind, but also ourselves, both materially and spiritually? Thus,

"New occasions teach new duties; time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still, and onward, who would keep abreast of Truth."

An Interpretation of Karl Heim

HUGH THOMSON KERR, JR.

SUCH phrases as "the crisis theology," "the dialectic theology," "neo-Calvinism," "modern continental theology," are usually associated with the names of Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, and Karl Heim. They are the great triumvirate in theology today. But while both Barth and Brunner are comparatively well known in English-speaking countries, directly through their translated works and indirectly through their influence, Heim has never seemed to attract the attention or acclaim given his colleagues although a fair proportion of his works has appeared in English and on several occasions he has visited both Great Britain and America. We in America know even less about Heim than the British. We have had to wait more than a year for an American edition of the English translation of Heim's greatest work.

There may be many reasons for Heim's relative obscurity. Some would suggest that Heim has not yet come into his own outside Germany, and they would point to the fact that in America especially we have lagged behind the rest of the world theologically. Others would reason that Heim remains relatively obscure simply because he does not make so loud a noise as either Barth or Brunner, and they would point to the fact that extremist views have always received the greatest publicity. Still others, no doubt, would bluntly declare that Heim has made no lasting contribution to theology, and so aside from merely having a place in the history of modern German theology he deserves to remain obscure.

Whatever the reason for Heim's relative obscurity, no student of modern theology can rightfully cast him aside with an idle gesture. Heim lectures to the largest class in theology in Germany. It was the late Professor H. R. Mackintosh's opinion that Karl Heim is one of the greatest minds in European theology today. That does not mean that he thought less of Barth or Brunner, for in a posthumous volume he distinctly states that "In spite of ever-recurring rumors that his (Barth's) influence is waning, there is every likelihood that it will increase."¹ Nevertheless, when advising graduate students wishing to continue their studies abroad he invariably

¹ *Types of Modern Theology*, Nisbet, London, p. 264.

suggested Tübingen and Karl Heim. I was one of the many who took that advice and will ever be grateful for it.²

In what follows I have tried to give an interpretation and appreciation of Heim, first as a man, second as a writer, and third as a thinker.

I

Karl Heim was born in the little village of Frauenzimmern, Württemberg, where his father was pastor, on January 20, 1874. After his university work at Tübingen where he studied for five years, he ministered to a church in the village of Giengen. His first position of importance was Secretary to the Student Christian Movement in Germany, a movement in which he still maintains an active interest. For seven years he was Privat-Dozent, an unsalaried lecturer, in the theological faculty of the University of Halle where the worthy pietist, August Herrmann Francke, labored many years before and whose influence impressed Heim deeply, for Heim's own religious background is the pietism of Württemberg. At the opening of the War, Heim was made Ordentlicher or Senior Professor at the University of Münster, a chair which was later filled by Karl Barth and Otto Piper, both of whom were compelled to leave Germany. Since 1920 Heim has been Professor of Theology at the University of Tübingen, being appointed Dean of the Protestant Faculty in 1935. Though his duties in Germany have been excessive, he has found time to travel on occasions in the interest of the Church to China, Palestine, America, and Great Britain. In 1935 he delivered the James Sprunt Lectures at Union Seminary, Richmond, Va., and the University of Edinburgh conferred the D.D. degree upon him in July, 1936, an honor which moved Heim deeply but one which, he felt, was saddened by the untimely death in June of Professor Mackintosh.

In appearance Karl Heim is distinguished, giving an impression of reserved dignity. He is short in stature, always stands erect, his eyes are bright, his goatee is closely trimmed, he has a habit of keeping his arms in front of him with his hands clasped, and he speaks in a soft voice with a barely noticeable hesitation. In manner he is quiet and unprepossessing. He is the very opposite of the blustering, somewhat eccentric Barth. His whole bearing reflects his pietistic background, yet he has a rare sense of humor, perhaps his most un-German characteristic. Frau Heim, who grew

² Heim's English translator, Professor Edgar P. Dickie of Saint Andrews, acknowledges his debt to Doctor Mackintosh for introducing him to the works of Heim.

up in the neighborhood of Tübingen, is a charming woman and a devoted wife. Her knowledge of the Bible is amazing, and on more than one occasion I have heard her correct her husband's reference to chapter and verse. They live alone on the lower floor of an old mediaeval house in quiet humility and simplicity. Heim's study is lined with book shelves; his desk chair faces the window with the garden and the Neckar River beyond. The garden, around which runs a portion of the stone wall of the old town, is the scene of many afternoon teas during the summer months. They delight in entertaining students, and often there are informal suppers preceded by a blessing, usually the first verse of Psalm 106, and occasionally concluding with the singing of a hymn. Heim is something of a painter, but he exhibits his canvases rarely and with embarrassing modesty. One picture on his wall shows the final resting place of August Herrmann Francke of Halle and is an indication of his reverence for the famous pietist.

In Tübingen Heim is an important figure. He is well known not only by the students who fill the largest classroom in the university to hear his lectures, but also by the town people who like to have him preach in the local *Stiftskirche*. His is a unique position in Germany, for associated with him on different faculties are Karl Adam, the outstanding Roman Catholic theologian, and Wilhelm Hauer, the originator of the so-called German Faith Movement.

Typical of his native land, Heim is a prodigious worker. When I asked him one day what he was reading for relaxation, he said that at the time he was enjoying Merejkowski's *Jesus the Unknown*. He has adopted for himself Zola's motto, *Nulla dies sine linea*, and one day after a prolonged walk over the Tübingen hills when I apologized for keeping him from his work, he responded, "Oh, no, I have written my line for today."

Ostensibly at least, Heim is a good Nazi. He makes the salute before every lecture and is an admirer of Hitler on political and economic grounds, attributing to him the unification and renaissance of modern Germany. In point of fact many feel that Heim has compromised with the State. No one would probably go so far as to accuse him of cowardice or hypocrisy, but in the light of the courageous stand which Barth and others have taken against state interference in church matters, Heim's position seems to be somewhat short of what might be expected. For my part I have never been persuaded that Heim has made any serious compromise. In repeated personal conversations, in the tone and temper of his Tübingen sermons, even in his writ-

ings, I find no evidence for cowardice, hypocrisy, intentional or unintentional compromise. It may be that in the last year his attitude toward the government has become more marked, but it remains that up until 1936 he was outspoken and frank in his disavowal of the State's right to meddle in the religious life of its people. When he was ordered by the government in September, 1935, to refuse an invitation to speak at a Confessional Synod, he complied, but only on the understanding that his acquiescence in this initial case be not interpreted as indicating his complete submission to the State's demands and that in the future such incidents would be determined according to his Christian conscience. The fact that Heim accepted the official request is not so important perhaps as the fact that the government actually made such a demand of him. Heim, after all, is a German and rightly or wrongly counts himself a patriotic citizen. If not so blunt and audacious as Barth, he nevertheless is under official surveillance, and on his own confession has no assurance of the permanency of his university post. Moreover, the German Christian Church, which is admittedly an attempt to combine National Socialism and Christianity, is especially abhorrent to Heim's thinking, and he denounces it with the same vehemence which he levels at the quite anti-Christian German Faith Movement.

II

One revealing and rewarding approach to Heim can be made by drawing up a descriptive bibliography of his works. Bibliographies, to be sure, are usually dull and prosaic but in the case of Heim the very titles of his books suggest his breadth of mind, wide interests, and cosmopolitan outlook. Like all German theologians he has written a great deal on an amazing variety of subjects. It was said of Troeltsch that he wrote too much and in too great a hurry, and indeed the criticism applies to a great extent to most German theologians.³ Heim's saving grace as a writer is his lucidity. Unlike many of his colleagues he is fond of illustrations, and this is to be the more wondered at since much of his interest lies in science and metaphysics.

Heim's first publication was an essay on psychology which appeared before he was thirty years of age.⁴ From then on his pen was never idle, and when he was fifty-seven he undertook to begin a *magnum opus* in the form

³ Professor John Baillie of Edinburgh likes to point out that German students find Troeltsch so difficult that they prefer to read him in French translations. Cf. Barth's *The Doctrine of the Word of God* with its 560 pages, and it is only the first part of Volume One of a prolegomena!

⁴ *Psychologismus oder Antipsychologismus*, 1903.

of a trilogy. The first book to attract any attention was concerned with a scientific interpretation of the universe,⁵ a subject which has continued to make its appeal and one in which Heim moves freely and knowingly both as scientist and theologian. Even at this stage one can see the two-sidedness of Heim's interest. He is not only the scientist, he is the evangelical theologian. He thinks not only in terms of scientific categories, he lives in the vocabulary of the New Testament. The late Charles E. Jefferson, the prince of American preachers, as he was often called, said once that the Bible was in his blood, and the same might be said of Heim. He is the scientific pietist and the pietistic scientist. Nowhere is this combination more evident than in the chronological list of his works. Thus, from a *Weltbild* he can turn to a study of the doctrine of grace.⁶ Heim's theology is theology on the wing. He begins with a scientific view of the universe, moves on to one of the Christian doctrines, and unable to rest with either plunges straight into metaphysics and then headlong into the whole subject of systematic theology.⁷ The *Leitfaden*, which is a manual designed for the use of students taking Heim's courses at the university, is still in use and has gone through three revisions.⁸

During the early years of the War there appeared in succession under Heim's name a monograph on the soul, a discussion of the problem of life, an essay entitled "Peace with God," and a lecture on the struggle of youth to find a satisfactory philosophy of life.⁹ All of these publications, especially the last, indicate something of the stress and strain of the War. Heim was profoundly disturbed by the religious agnosticism occasioned by the War, and he sought on every hand to assure youth that in spite of war God is a "bulwark never failing" and in Him alone is true peace to be had.

In 1925 Heim delivered a series of lectures at Tübingen on the general subject of Roman Catholicism and Evangelical Protestantism with such success that he consented to their publication. Ten years later this book was translated into English,¹⁰ and it has been widely acclaimed.

⁵ *Das Weltbild der Zukunft*, 1904.

⁶ *Das Wesen der Gnade bei Alexander Halesius*, 1906.

⁷ *Das Gewissheitsproblem in der systematischen Theologie*, 1911; *Leitfaden der Dogmatik*, 1912.

⁸ Not only theological students but arts and science students as well hear Heim's especially popular course on science and religion. The lectures are very formal, they begin with the Nazi salute, followed by the salutation: "Meine Damen und Herren." However, Heim's lectures are frequently punctuated with a sly, subtle humor.

⁹ *Aus der Heimat der Seele*, 1915; *Glaubensgewissheit*, 1916; *Friede mit Gott*, 1916; *Der Krieg und die Ringen der Studenten um eine Weltanschauung*, 1917 (cf. *Die Weltanschauung der Bibel*, 1920).

¹⁰ *Das Wesen des Evangelischen Christentums*, 1925 (Eng. Tr., *Spirit and Truth*, Lutterworth Press, London, 1935).

In the following year appeared a group of essays and lectures, thirty-two in number, with the vague comprehensive title *Faith and Life*.¹¹ Well over seven hundred pages, this book contains a weird assortment of subjects and shows something of the flexibility of Heim's mind. The only way to describe this book is to mention some of the chapter titles. Beginning with an introduction on the aim and purpose of his own theology, which is an insistence on the unity of scientific and religious truth, we are asked to look at the philosophy of "als-ob," the theory of double-truth, the bearing on theology of Einstein's theory of relativity, Japanese Buddhism, supernatural healing, the present-day problem of apologetics, Tolstoi and Jesus, the late Rudolph Otto's idea of the Holy, eternal life, Oswald Spengler, Christianity and politics, prayer as a philosophical problem, time and eternity, certain unsolved questions, the message of the New Testament for the heathen! Three of the chapters of this "thesaurus," as it is known in Germany, namely, supernatural healing, time and eternity, and the message of the New Testament for the heathen, were translated into English four years after the volume appeared and served as the first introduction of Heim to English readers.¹²

Heim can never be accused of pedantry, his theology is always related to present circumstances. For the next five years, prior to the initial volume of the series upon which he is still working, he published three essays dealing with modern questions in theology, the first on religion and the modern temper, the second on God and society, and the third on mysticism.¹³ The last two of these were published by the Christian Student Movement Press in Germany, as have several other of Heim's books,¹⁴ and demonstrate his continued interest in the Movement of which he was its quondam secretary. The essay on mysticism was written in collaboration with a Japanese student, Samurai Kokichi Kurosaki, who studied at Tübingen and became an intimate friend of Heim's.

In 1931 the first edition of Volume One of a proposed trilogy appeared and was eagerly bought up, so that a second edition was immediately prepared. The popularity of the book was due not so much to its content, it is without doubt the most prolix of Heim's works, but to its professed purpose. The series which Heim set himself to write bore the general title, "The

¹¹ *Glaube und Leben*, 1926. (In 1932 a supplement of this collection of essays appeared with the title *Leben aus dem Glauben*).

¹² *The New Divine Order*, Christian Student Movement Press, 1930.

¹³ *Religion und Modernes Geistesleben*, 1927; *Die Neue Welt Gottes*, 1928; *Mystik oder Versöhnung*, 1930.

¹⁴ For example, *Friede mit Gott; Ungelöste Fragen; Der Weg zu Herzen Gottes*.

Protestant Evangelical Faith and Present-Day Thought: Outlines of a Christian View of Life." Volume One was called *Faith and Thought*, and promised to set forth the philosophical foundations for the Christian view of life.¹⁵ It must be remembered that until the appearance of this volume, Heim had confined his writings to essays and lectures. These had served to introduce him to both scientific and theological circles, and so when this *magnum opus* was announced many felt that the book would be epoch-making. A new edition was prepared and appeared in 1934, written in the light of the philosophy of the Third Reich. Although this edition contained some of the material of the first edition, it was essentially a new book, strange to say only half the size of the original, and with a different apologetic purpose in view.¹⁶

Heim's interest in the third edition was not to establish a Christian *Weltanschauung* as over against no *Weltanschauung*, as in the first edition, but as over against a misguided and pagan *Weltanschauung*, the outgrowth of National Socialism. The first and third editions do not differ in aim and purpose but in method and approach.

It had been announced that the second volume of Heim's trilogy was to be a discussion of modern difficulties with the Person of Christ.¹⁷ This was to be followed by the concluding volume dealing with the relation of the Christian belief in God and modern science.¹⁸ However, this original plan was altered so that when the second volume appeared it bore the title *Jesus the Lord*,¹⁹ and the proposed trilogy was expanded into a quattrain to include yet another volume on the Person of Christ. Whereas the original announcement suggested that the second volume would be something in the nature of a Christology, the actual volume denies that it is a *Glaubenslehre* and seeks rather to posit an incisive "either-or" in regard to the Lordship of Jesus—either we put our whole trust in Him, or we must abandon Him altogether.

The third volume of this series has just been published. It is a sequel to the second and is called *Jesus the World-Fulfiller*.²⁰ In this book Heim deals with the Person of Christ and His relation to eschatology. The book

¹⁵ *Glaube und Denken; Philosophische Grundlegung Einer Christlichen Lebensanschauung*, 1931.

¹⁶ It is from this third edition that the English translation has been made with the title changed to read, *God Transcendent*, Nisbet, London, 1935. Heim has said of this translation that it is a better book than the German original.

¹⁷ *Der Christusglaube im Geisteskampf der Gegenwart*.

¹⁸ *Der christliche Gottesglaube und die moderne Naturwissenschaft*.

¹⁹ *Jesus der Herr: die Führervollmacht Jesu und die Gottesoffenbarung in Christus*, 1935.

²⁰ *Jesus der Weltvollender: der Glaube an die Versöhnung und Weltverwandlung*, March, 1937.

is not a text on eschatology but is rather an interpretation and application of the Christian experience typical of the first century which knew the power of Christ to change and transform both individuals and society.

In 1935, while in the midst of his trilogy, Heim made a visit to America primarily to deliver the James Sprunt Lectures at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.²¹ These lectures were written with American life and thought in mind. They deal with a variety of subjects, Luther, sin, prayer, et cetera, but they are all related to the American temper and help to answer the question which arises in the minds of many as to whether Heim's theology is applicable outside Germany.

Throughout the busy years of Heim's teaching career he has found time to do a great deal of preaching. Many of his sermons, I have counted over fifty, have been printed either in pamphlet form or in little volumes, some of which have been translated into English.²² Heim is a popular preacher in the best sense of the word. He is never sensational or clever, but preaches simple expository sermons which are always fresh and living, due to his keen insight and interpretation of Scripture. He preaches quietly without the use of gestures, and he has a way of tying his thought to common life. His written style is marked by a frequent use of illustration, and his prose often borders on poetry.

While in Edinburgh in 1935 Heim delivered two lectures on the subject, "The Present Situation of Theology in Germany," which were later printed in *The Expository Times*,²³ and in which, among other things, he set forth his estimate of the Barthian theology.

Recently a little volume has appeared in this country including essays on the German Faith Movement by Wilhelm Hauer, Karl Adam, and Karl Heim, Tübingen's three great theologians.²⁴ There are of course many books and articles in German on the theology of Heim.²⁵ In 1934 a volume of essays contributed by several theologians was dedicated to Heim on his sixtieth birthday.²⁶ Although most of the essays were on general subjects, some dealt specifically with certain phases of Heim's thought.

²¹ *The Church of Christ and the Problems of the Day*, Scribners, 1935.

²² For example, *Die lebendige Quelle*, 1927 (Eng. Tr., *The Living Fountain*, 1936); *Das Wort vom Kreuz*, 1930 (*The Gospel of the Cross*, 1937); *Die Kraft Gottes*, 1936 (*The Power of God*, 1937).

²³ November and December, 1936.

²⁴ *Germany's New Religion*, Abingdon Press, 1937.

²⁵ For example, Martin Thust, *Das perspektivische Weltbild Karl Heims*, 1925; W. Ruttenbeck, *Die apologetisch-theologische Methode Karl Heims*, 1925; F. Spemann, *Karl Heim und die Theologie seiner Zeit*, 1932.

²⁶ *Wort und Geist*, 1934.

III

In order to understand something of the tone and temper of Heim's thought as well as its direction and purpose, it is necessary to know how he himself evaluates the history of theology. Roughly he divides modern theology into two periods, pre-War and post-War. Pre-War theology is characterized by the rationalistic flavor of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, by the authority of reason, by the Kantian belief that man is free and autonomous (and so later Ritschl), by the Hegelian identity of infinite and finite (with the emphasis on the eternal truths of Christianity as in Strauss), and by the emphasis on experience as the seat of religious reality (so Schleiermacher and later Otto). In short, pre-War theology was interested in discovering a way to God whether morally as Kant suggested, intellectually as with Hegel, or emotionally as with Schleiermacher. It was felt that man could work out his own salvation because he carries in his bosom a divine spark which needs only a little fanning to make it burst into a holy flame. The World War terminated this rationalistic trend. Man was no longer regarded as free and autonomous, able to work out his own salvation; the War proved that he was not able to do just that. Abstract principles of Christianity, such as the identity of the infinite and the finite, were abandoned, as were all abstract principles. Likewise, the War put an end to the feeling of awe and mystery so essential to Otto's *Idea of the Holy*. Thus, the War marked the end of theological "liberalism" because in that futile struggle the limitation of man's powers was clearly seen.

When the limits of man's abilities were realized, there were but two possible alternatives for him—either despair or faith. In Germany, up until the inauguration of the Nazi regime, despair was the characteristic attitude of the time. Oswald Spengler's *Decline of the West* was a true representation of the situation. Such is not fertile ground for theology; it must either disappear altogether or make a "Tell's leap" from the very wave which threatens to destroy it to the rock which stands fast on the shore. It is this leap of despair which characterizes post-War theology.

The leap from despair to faith, from relativism to transcendence, was first made by Karl Barth with his *Epistle to the Romans*. It was against this peculiar background that the Barthians took their stand, repudiating philosophy and the authority of reason and substituting the revelation of a Wholly Other who breaks in upon the hearing believer. For many this reaction

against a defunct liberalism is the greatest contribution of the Barthian school. Their emphasis on revelation as over against religion, their realistic view of the gravity of sin and guilt, their passionate zeal in proclaiming the Word of God as the final authority as over against reason, was a necessary corrective, or as Barth himself terms his own contribution, "a pinch of cinnamon." Nevertheless it has been felt by many that if liberalism had gone to one extreme, Barthianism was fast heading toward another. As H. R. Mackintosh used to say, the Barthians are like a group of men in a boat who when they see that it is nearly capsizing on the one side think the only way to correct the balance is to lean too far in the other direction.

Heim's criticism of Barthianism is that it has not kept up with the times. Immediately following the War, when German youth were at a loss for a positive *Weltanschauung*, Barthianism served as a refuge and a rock of safety from the tempest of relativism. But with the advent of the Third Reich this relativistic despair was transformed into a positive faith in the principles of National Socialism. Whereas German youth before the accession of Hitler were without guidance living lives without direction, now with the ideals of the State and the heritage of Germany before them they have found a positive philosophy of life which gives meaning and direction to their lives. The ideas of race, blood, and nation became the articles of a new German creed.

Since 1933, therefore, the situation in Germany has radically changed. Youth are no longer seeking a philosophy of life, they have one. In such a situation Barthianism can have but little appeal, for the Christian message is regarded as a competitor to National Socialism and unless it can defend its message it will be neglected in favor of a German faith. "Tell's leap" is not so easy to make in present-day Germany because despair has been superseded by hope in the nation.

Whenever the Christian message is proclaimed in modern Germany, two questions are immediately forthcoming, according to Heim. First of all, a philosophical question is asked—Has this other, spiritual, transcendent world of which Christianity speaks any real meaning? And secondly a practical question is asked—If this other world exists, can it have any influence on this present world? German youth demand definite answers to these two questions because if they cannot be answered they will cling to their faith in the German race, blood, and nation which has a definite philosophical content and practical significance.

Heim has seen the acuteness of modern philosophical problems, together with the refusal of the dialectic theology to treat them as serious, and so has taken upon himself the task of bridging the gap between questioning youth and dogmatic theology. The Barthians would separate distinctly between philosophy and theology. Heim goes back to the temper of Augustine's age when philosophy and theology were one. The unity of truth is the major premise of his thinking. Heim's method accordingly, in proclaiming the Christian message, is to begin with the ultimate problems of the philosophy of religion and the relation of science and theology and show the way through these questions, not around them as Barth seems to do, to the Christian faith.

Again, Heim is not unaware of the passionate loyalty of present-day German youth, in its religious expression seen in the German Faith Movement, and he sees likewise the inability of Barthianism to give a clear answer to the practical questions which youth are asking. It is not enough, he says, to say with Barth, "I will express in my life and work the infinite qualitative difference between God and man. I will thus live to the glory of God, realizing that all my own living and doing are in vain." That may be true enough, says Heim, but I must know something more, I must know *how* I can glorify God at every moment of my life.

The interesting thing about Heim is the twofold nature of his thinking. He is both scientist and Christian. He proclaims the Gospel with the same prophetic ardor as Barth, yet he may begin with Einstein's theory of relativity or Vaihinger's philosophy of "Als-Ob." He will have his say out on time and eternity, he will subtitle his main work as the foundation for a Christian metaphysic, yet withal he ends with the clarion call of the Gospel message. This twofold aspect is patent everywhere in his writings. It is to be seen on the last page of the *Glaube und Denken*, it also appears in numerous essays in the *Glaube und Leben*, in the introduction to the *New Divine Order*, and in the schema of the *Leitfaden* lectures. This double interest of Heim's, however, must not be understood as though he felt that the Christian message could be found, discovered, or appropriated by means of scientific or metaphysical thinking. Nor does he treat the two aspects of his thought as two separate and unrelated spheres of truth. He knows too well the limits of rationalization on the one hand, and he is convinced of the unity of truth on the other hand. His purpose rather is to preach the Gospel, but to preach it in terms which are capable of communicating its truth. It is

not enough, he says, to "proclaim the Word of God," it must be proclaimed in such a way as to demand a hearing.

The chief difference between Barth and Heim is one of method, for they are at one in aim and purpose. They both proclaim the Word of God, but they do so in different ways. Barth sounds a lone trumpet blast to waken believers out of their torpid slumber; Heim conducts a symphony orchestra of many different instruments all playing around a single leitmotif. The very fact that Barth and Heim are so nearly at one in their message explains to some extent the apparently inconsistent estimates which Heim makes at times of the dialectic theology. For although he criticizes it for its dogmatic approach, he speaks in general the same language, and in one place at least defines the essence of the Gospel in typical Barthian terms. The Gospel, he says, proclaims the fact that God in Christ takes hold of me, the sinner, not because I deserve redemption, not because I can bring Him anything of worth, for I can be worthy in the sight of God, in Luther's phrase, only through the imputed righteousness of Christ. And this is the message which Heim preaches again and again. It is found at the center of *Jesus der Herr*, it is the stage, as it were, upon which the drama of eschatology as seen in *Jesus der Weltvollender* is enacted, it is patent in the American Sprunt lectures, especially in the sections on Luther and in the sensitive appreciation of the mysticism of Kurosaki and Pandita Ramabai, it forms the text of all of Heim's sermons, it makes possible the Christian missionary enterprise concerning which Heim has written some five essays, and it is the magnetic pole to which his university lectures point.

To be sure, Heim is not above criticism. If he has avoided some of the pitfalls of the dialectic theology he has fallen into some of his own making, but the main difficulty in criticizing Heim, from the philosophical or scientific side, is that such criticism does not really touch his central message. How can you criticize the metaphysics of a man who autographs your copy of the *Glaube und Denken* with the words, "In Christ are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge!"

Recent European Theology

R. BIRCH HOYLE

“**E**UROPEAN” may fairly stand, for here we have books from a Swiss, a Swede, several Britishers, Germans, and they represent Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, and Methodist Churches. The republic of letters knows no geographical frontiers. All these books start, as they ought, from the Word of God. Several are of an expository character; others are theological in the fullest sense of the term; one and all deserve the closest study.

The book of Ezekiel has at last appeared in the International Critical Commentary series (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh). For over twenty years Dr. G. A. Cooke, of Oxford, has had it “on the stocks,” a-building. It has been well worth-while waiting that time. For within the last dozen years “Ezekiel” has been analyzed, vivisected, and almost slain as a reliable book. Herrmann, Hoelscher, Herntrich, Bertholet in Germany, C. C. Torrey and James Smith in U. S. A., have cut it up. Now Doctor Cooke comes along with careful, scholarly methods. Three main problems arise: Did Ezekiel prophesy in Babylon or Jerusalem? Are the psychical phenomena, clairvoyance, telepathy, levitation, real experiences? Did the same pen write such fine poetry and often bald prose? Doctor Cooke rejects Smith’s and Herntrich’s view that Jerusalem and not Babylon was the scene of the ministry. Babylon was rejected by both Hoelscher and Herntrich because “no scientific person nowadays believes in such a thing (as) second sight.” Doctor Cooke accepts “second sight”; he also thinks, though the distinction between the poetry and the prose is strongly marked, the points of contact between them suggest a common source. A fine passage runs, “To a man of Ezekiel’s temperament the unseen was more vividly present than the seen, every faculty of his nature was engaged on Jahveh’s side, he could speak of nothing, he could think of nothing but the dishonor which Israel had done to Jahveh and the punishment which was about to follow. . . . Mere distance does not count in the range of a prophet’s message.” So we can read with more confidence that prophetic book.

Some are disturbed by the application of the methods of Form Criticism to the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics. A Cambridge don, Dr. B. T.

D. Smith, uses these methods in his book, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Study* (Cambridge University Press). Unlike R. H. Lightfoot, who said, in his Bampton Lectures, "It is most difficult to penetrate the luminous haze 'that' surrounds the figure of Jesus," Doctor Smith declares, "We have good reasons for believing that the great majority of the parables in the Synoptic Gospels represent authentic parables of Jesus. It is perhaps the parables with their kindly intimate presentation of human character, their humor and their irony, which reveal to us most clearly Jesus of Nazareth." Much use is made of illustrative material from parallels in other literature, and Rabbinics: the textual variants are minutely scrutinized; fresh suggestions of great service to the preacher emerge in this book, which is a fine tool to his hands.

Dr. Vincent Taylor's name stands foremost among British scholars occupied with Form Criticism. His book on *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (Macmillan) won fame, and is a credit to Methodism. In that work he argued that the Passion Story was about the first bit of Gospel set in order. "The first Passion Stories," he said, "were shaped by the earliest preaching and by repetition during the meetings of the communities to break bread." In a talk I had with Doctor Taylor last summer, he said that for some years he had been at work on that precious section of our Lord's teaching and sacrifice: now he has produced a rich volume—*Jesus and His Sacrifice: A Study of the Passion-Sayings* (Macmillan). The central section of the three which compose the book is a masterly examination of those passages and Paul's story (1 Corinthians 11). Here we feel that we are on solid ground. The first section rightly takes up the Old Testament material, especially Isaiah 53, which would be in our Lord's mind. The third section develops into a doctrinal treatise on the Atonement. Doctor Taylor will not have it that the teaching of Jesus concerning His death is a later church theology which was added and put into the mouth of Jesus. He holds that "Jesus must have thought of His suffering as a sacrificial offering in which men might participate." That Death was a "self-offering"; in it were blended perfect obedience to the Father's will, perfect submission to God's judgment on sin; perfect penitence for the sins of mankind whom Jesus represents.

"In the work of Christ the offering is made representatively, in the name of men, and with the intention that they should participate therein." And one way of participating is at the Lord's Table. This study should

strengthen conviction that here the Christian is following "no cunningly devised fables."

Quite a host of books take up the doctrine of the Atonement. Doctor Oesterley has one on *Sacrifices in Ancient Israel: Their Origin, Purposes and Development* (Hodder & Stoughton). He has a thorough knowledge of the background of the New Testament; he describes the varieties of sacrifices and their triple meanings of gift, communion and releasing of life. Better still, he traces the development and purification of the ideas attaching to sacrifice until it climaxes and supersedes all other sacrifices in the self-oblation of our Lord. Doctor Oesterley, however, while admitting the force of the apostolic interpretations of Christ's death, does not think they gain support from Jesus' own teaching. Here Doctor Taylor needs to be heard.

From Germany comes Karl Heim's contribution on the Atonement. It is the second part of the second volume of his *magnum opus*, *Evangelical Faith and Present-day Thought*. The first part was, "Jesus, der Herr;" this part has as title (in English) "Jesus, the World Perfector: the Faith in the Reconciliation and the Changing of the World" (Furche, Berlin). The mission of Jesus was "to lift the burden which crushes down the world in the abysmal depth of its separation from God." As a good Lutheran, Heim is fully convinced of the existence of a personal devil, and deliverance from that fell foe is prominent in this book. On the problem of the coexistence of "depths of God," and "depths of Satan," Heim says, "We are compelled to accept two propositions which we can never bring into accord. One is: God is, and even in the devil He alone works. The other is: God has no part in the diabolical resistance; for, if God Himself shared in the devil's qualities, He could not regard us as responsible if we take part in the devil's revolt." Now Christ's chief work was, in Johannine phrase, "to destroy the works of the devil" and ultimately, the devil himself. Heim carries Christ's work beyond the mere saving of individuals: it has a cosmic reference. The Resurrection was the in-break of the New Creation of the world. We now live in the interval between that starting of world-restoration and its completion, when "God shall be all in all." "There is," he says, "no true belief in God without an expectation of the End." There is little of the "blessed assurance" for the individual in Heim's view: "Perhaps it is God's holy design that during all our life on earth we must remain in trembling uncertainty as to whether the Restoration of the World will mean our personal salvation." For we are "hell-deserving sinners."

A more cheerful prospect is given by Canon W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, the Anglican priest, in his beautifully written book, *The Redeemer* (Longmans, London). The Canon emphasizes the Godward aspect of the Redeemer's work: "Its essence lies in the fact that it is the one and only perfect Reparation offered to the Eternal Holiness." With lucid exposition of both Old Testament and New Testament scriptures, the priestly work of Christ is set forth. One chapter on the Parable of the Prodigal Son is valuable as refuting those who would construct a doctrine of Atonement on that alone, thus making repentance suffice for restoration to fellowship with God, without the need for Christ's sacrificial death. This he says is a caricature. He well brings out the Church's teaching in the Liturgies, and leads to "the intense relief, the exuberant joyousness, the gratitude" of those who sang, "Thou hast redeemed us unto God by Thy blood." The favorite term, "reparation," needs further elucidation.

Behind these studies of the Atonement there lies a doctrine of man, full of difficulties. Emil Brunner deals with them in his new book (in English), *Man in the Contradiction* (Furche, Berlin). For fifteen years Brunner has been at work on what, in the subtitle, he calls "The Christian Doctrine of the True and the Actual Man." All the various views of man as viewed by archaeology, evolution, physiology, sociology, psychology, from the Stone Age to this era of electricity and radio, are set out here. They all fail to account for the rift in human nature; the gap between the "actual" man as he has been and is, and the "real" man he ought to be; the mingled grandeur and misery of his dual nature; the sense of forlornness and impotence in the midst of nature, of which he is the crown and victim. Against this is put the Biblical view of man: made by God: from his source and origin fallen, and in "contradiction." Brunner deals with the church doctrines of man's creation, fall, man as "in the image of God," how far that has been distorted or effaced; how far these doctrines must be modified in view of our fuller, more accurate knowledge of human nature. For, he says, "the entire church tradition has been overloaded with certain fundamental axioms which men wrongly regard as Bible truth, and which rightly provoke protest from opposers of church doctrine." It is truly a great book, both for the immense range of its interests, and the clarity of its style. It will flutter many an ecclesiastical dove-cote.

We have no space in which to describe two other books bearing on the Union of the Churches. The Swedish Lutheran, Nils Ehrenstroem, in

Christian Faith and the Modern State: An Ecumenical Approach (Student Movement, London), gathers together the various views of the relation of Church and State as held by Romanists, Greek Orthodox, Lutherans, Reformed, and Anglican Churchmen; their application to the modern Total States; the *pros* and *cons* of these views. As such it is a useful and timely production for all Churchmen to ponder.

The other book is a surprise. Its title (in English) is *Catholicism: Its Dying and Rising Again* (Hinrichs, Leipzig). Gustave Mensching, of Bonn, compiled from Roman Catholic theologians and laymen criticisms of that Church; its being fast-bound to a sterile Aquinian philosophy; its antiquated, moribund theology quite out of touch with current thought. On the constructive side is brought out wherein abiding values of truth remain in Romanism; and a plea is put in for a synthesis of similarly worthy truths held by Protestants. Such a book, of course, was not submitted for official "imprimaturs"; names are seldom given of men living: Tyrrell, von Hügel, and others are fully quoted. The drastic criticism of curial Rome is sure to put this book on the Index. Its intention, however, is to make confessional peace. We seek a synthesis of "catholic" and "protestant," a thorough permeation mutually of these elements, not of the two "isms"; that would be utopian. But these would go back behind the long institutional history to the pure Evangelical teaching of the New Testament. "The Gospel is the home-ground upon which the separated brothers can find themselves together again, and in the spirit of understanding love can mutually shake hands." After such a book one may say there is hope still for distressed Christianity in Europe!

Book Reviews

The Future of Christianity. By
EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN.
New York: The Abingdon Press.
\$1.50.

THIS is a small book upon a large theme. Professor Brightman does not claim to be a prophet nor a prophet's son, and deals with the question presented by the title in his usual simple, modest, empirical fashion. But while he does not pretend to clairvoyant powers, he does bring to the attention of his readers certain considerations which are obviously relevant to the question at issue. The first of the four lectures which make up the book is, in fact, devoted to a discussion of our knowledge of the future—to what extent and by what means we may be able to formulate a reasonably probable picture of what the conditions and the beliefs of the coming centuries are to be. The thoughtful reader will pretty surely agree with the author in his conclusion that universal, philosophical principles are here more relevant than the particular facts which history and natural science contribute.

The question of the future of Christianity is identified with the future of the central faith in the supremacy of spirit over matter. And while this faith is closely connected with the future of the Bible and the Church, it stands or falls not with them but with God. The second of the four chapters is, indeed, devoted to an excellent discussion of the Church and the Bible, but this is really parenthetical, and the crux of the matter is reached in the third chapter on "The Future of God." "Only if God is real and God is with us may we look into the future with genuine confidence. . . .

The future of Christianity and of civilization, then, depends ultimately on God. . . . God is the foundation of our hope." Hence the fundamental question about the future of Christianity is really the question whether the Christian belief in God is true. Readers of Professor Brightman's *Problem of God*, and of his recent Presidential Address before the American Philosophical Association, will be already acquainted with the type of argument by which he justifies the theistic conclusion. It is essentially empirical in nature, and will appeal with varying degrees of force to various readers. Professor Brightman does not claim that it is conclusive: but he believes that the theistic hypothesis fits the acknowledged facts better than any other and is, therefore, exceedingly probable. If this is granted, Professor Brightman feels the question of the future of Christianity is in large outline answered. "Is Christianity going to fail? The long perspective of faith enables us to look ahead with confidence."

Confidence is a good word; and the chief value of the book will probably consist in the increase of a reasoned confidence on the part of those who already have faith in the future of Christianity. The skeptical reader will raise the question whether Professor Brightman's theistic arguments point to the *kind* of God that he and Christianity believe in; or, to word it differently, whether the belief in the "supremacy of the spiritual over matter," which the book has shown to be probable, is really the same thing as the "Christianity" which his readers are interested in and of which he himself says: "The Bible is the soul and the Church is

the body of Christianity. It is impossible for Christianity to survive without soul or without body."

JAMES BISSETT PRATT.

Williams College.

The Minister: His World and His Work. By WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN. Nashville: Cokesbury Press. \$2.00.

THERE is never any doubt about what Doctor Brown is saying when he writes. He writes simply about profound subjects, and with an eagerness and intensity which could well be emulated by many preachers younger in years.

The author comes close to the preacher's mind and heart when he states that most of the problems which the minister faces today are no longer confined to those of his own congregation and community. They are world problems and he is asking how it is possible to fill the gap which exists between what the leaders are planning and saying, and what the parish minister is thinking and doing. In the end, it is not the leaders, but the parish minister, who must be the interpreter to his people of the function of the Church in our modern world.

One sits down with this book and does not leave it until he comes to the last page, all because the author throws a new light on problems which confront the minister every day. How can a minister be a Man of the World and a Man of God? How can he present a God who is adequate for the scientist and the humanist? How does the priestly in the minister function? Can he make God real to those who find it hard to realize the fact of God?

The minister as evangelist, teacher, and pastor, all come in for excellent treatment at the hands of a man who is not only a professor, but one who sits in the

place of the parish minister and looks through his eyes.

It is well that someone tell the minister the difference between what the Roman Catholic Church presents to the world, and what liberal Protestantism proposes to do. Doctor Brown does this admirably in the chapter, "What the World Has a Right to Expect of the Church." And when he discusses the *Social Gospel* he does so with two ideas uppermost in his thought: a unifying and life-giving gospel, and an unconquerable faith in its ultimate supremacy.

A preacher may well put this book on his desk, and when he is in danger of running off into by-paths, pick it up and let it bring him back into the way that will give point and lasting effectiveness to his ministry.

FREDERICK K. STAMM.

The Clinton Avenue Community Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Psychology and Religious Origins.

By T. HYWEL HUGHES. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.25.

THE author has undertaken a most comprehensive task—"an examination of the origins of religion and of the formation of religious ideas from the standpoint of psychology." The enormous amount of reading and research involved in the preparation of such a volume is apparent not only in the bibliography appended to the book but in the references and analyses which appear on nearly every page.

The present reviewer found satisfaction in the general tone of the book. It is neither defiantly belligerent nor embarrassingly apologetic. The author writes as one who is deeply and profoundly religious. He expects the concepts of religion to be changed and trans-

formed by the revelations which come from the newest of the sciences—psychology. He is quite confident, however, that religion itself will stand and not fall as a result of the studies in this field.

As I read the analyses of the various schools of psychology and of the different writers in these fields, I was reminded of a remark made by a distinguished church historian who was, himself, a real "comprehensive scholar." This man said to me, one day: "I do not know much Hebrew but I do know enough so that they cannot bamboozle me." The author of this volume does know a good deal about psychology. In fact, he seems to be entirely at home in the literature of that subject. He certainly knows enough so that none of them can "bamboozle" him. He moves along a very difficult path as one who is sure of the destination and the way that leads thereto.

Men who are somewhat familiar with the developments in this field will find this volume a handy reference book. It is comprehensive as well as compact. For those who have not done some careful reading in the field, it would be a difficult beginning. Often an analysis of some distinguished psychologist's point of view is given in a paragraph or two or in a page at best. Only those who already know something about the subject under consideration can hope to follow such a discussion easily.

Here is to be found a readable discussion in a rich and rewarding field. It lays no claim to finality. The author does not expect anyone to "accept all the conclusions here formulated." His own mood is suggested in this word: "No one is able to state all the truth on any subject. The most he can hope to do is to add a little to the great central light of truth."

HORACE G. SMITH.

Garrett Biblical Institute.

A Rustic Moralist. By W. R. INGE.
New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
\$3.00.

WHEN somewhat over three years ago the Dean of Saint Paul's retired to a farm in Berkshire he said "farewell" to his public and "almost" promised "not to waste any more ink and paper on his senile reflections." Those who knew the Dean best predicted that, barring serious illness or death, the promise could not be kept. Events prove that they were right. His apology for apparent perjury is very graceful and the latest collection—some fifty brilliant essays—fails to reveal any mark of senility. It is perhaps true that Doctor Inge has mellowed; it is certainly true that he has lost none of his characteristic, if not unique, qualities of mind and style. The act of discarding apron and gaiters for the more appropriate livery of a Rustic Moralist stole nothing from his deanship of contemporary essayists. What living man, using the English language, can say so much in so few words or, as a discerning critic has expressed it, "carry so lightly the mantle of immense learning"? The erudition of Doctor Inge is phenomenal. I question whether any other author is equipped to bring to the study of problems and events any comparable resources of scholarship, philosophy, theology, mysticism and wit.

A Rustic Moralist contains fifty-two essays. The subjects discussed include, Religion, Psychology, Social Problems, Politics, History, Education, Science, England, and Other Nations. Under the heading, "Substitutes for Religion," he discusses (for example) Communism, Fascism, Patriotism, Nazism, Business, Superstition, and Crank Beliefs. The variety of subjects—all the way from "Other People's Pleasures," to "A Future Life"—adds pleasure to the reading of

the book. Moreover, Doctor Inge discusses many of the burning questions of the hour and casts his critical eye on practically all of the contemporary ideologies to which there seems to be a growing (however lamentable) commitment. It is interesting to note that Doctor Inge proclaims, in no uncertain voice, that our holy religion implies a philosophy of its own—the *philosophia perennis*—as the Latin Church calls it, and which he finds most lucidly expressed by Neo-Thomists. He pays particularly high tribute to the thinking of Gilson and Maritain and the distinguished young American philosopher Msgr. Fulton Sheen. *A Rustic Moral* is a book of permanent value.

HOBART D. MCKEEHAN.

The Abbey Church,
Huntingdon, Pa.

Family and Church. By LEWIS J. SHERRILL. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$2.00.

ALL Gaul had its divisions and so does this book by Doctor Sherrill. Although the author arranges his material in four parts, the book, to this reviewer, has three personalities. The first three chapters deal with the family today. In the first chapter, the author gives his reasons for feeling that the church can help the family. These are objective and persuasive. His views are validated in the experiences of every pastor and of many scientific studies of the influence of the church on family life.

In the second chapter, the author gives a keen analysis of the forces in our modern culture which oppose the efforts of the homemaker in his quest for marital happiness. Supplementing his own observation, he bases many of his conclusions on the findings of recognized experts.

The third chapter deals with modern problems of the family and of marriage

—husband-wife relations, causes of marriage failure, parent-child relations, etc. The author gives an admirable analysis of findings of such authorities as Linquist, Woodhouse, Fiske, Hamilton, Dickinson, Beason, Davis, and Mowrer. This is one of the most helpful chapters in the book, and in itself, worth the whole price.

Beginning with the fourth chapter and continuing through the sixth, the author resorts to the historical method. Although ponderous at many points, he presents a background of religious culture for the family which is very helpful. The wish may be expressed that in these chapters the author had gone further than the traditional historical method. The home of the future can no more be built than one can walk forward looking backward. There are sociological and psychological factors not foreign to religious culture which also need to be considered.

From Chapter Seven on to the end of the book there is another *Personality* in evidence. Here the author turns to methodology and resources for the church that is interested in helping its families. Chapter Seven, on the family as a school of religion, is highly suggestive. This ought to be read by every parent. Chapter Eight suggests comprehensive objectives together with a program of family guidance for the church. The objectives are well stated, but the description of approach for the church is obviously weak and incomplete. The author gives nine pages, small type, to a statement of objectives and six pages to a description of methodology and approach. He perhaps meets this objection by referring to his large list of descriptions of what various churches are doing. However, the description would have more meaning if given in light of a working pattern for the local church.

Chapters Nine through Twelve give an amazing list of sources which the pas-

tor and other local workers in family guidance will find almost unlimited. The securing of these sources must have meant tedious and costly research. They are comprehensive and practical. The only points at which, to this reviewer, they seem inadequate, is in connection with pre-marital group education and in connection with pre-engagement personal guidance of young people.

Despite the few negative words about the organization of material and style of the author, here is a great book and one which should be in the hands of every pastor; every other religious leader; every parent-education worker; and every parent.

ROY A. BURKHART.

The First Community Church,
Columbus, Ohio.

Church and State in the Modern World. By VAN DUSEN, CALHOUN, CHAMBERLAIN, COFFIN, CAVERT. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$2.00.

SINCE 1929 there have been published six volumes, each composed of lectures delivered at the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School on the Walter Rauschenbusch Lectureship Foundation. This volume, the sixth in the series, is made up of five lectures delivered by Henry Pitt Van Dusen, Robert Lowry Calhoun, Joseph Perkins Chamberlain, Henry Sloane Coffin, and Samuel McCrea Cavert.

The five lectures share uniformly in excellent features and in limitations. At best, all of them are mere introductions to the theme due to the limitations of time and space. Careful editing and the addition of cross reference footnotes help the reader to follow particular themes as they may be treated by more than one lecturer. The chief limitation which is

to be found in the entire book is that for the most part the authors are discussing Church and State in the United States and not in the "Modern World." In the light of the contents the title should have been less pretentious. Many a provincial American at the Oxford Conference was led to exclaim that Oxford had led him to realize that the churchmen of Great Britain, of continental Europe, of the entire Eastern Orthodox fellowship live in an almost entirely different world—having reference not merely to geography, but to social, economic, political and ecclesiastical thought life.

These five lectures also have the weakness of being cast within a fairly uniform general theological mold within American church life. They have a very large degree of unity with regard to this one mold, but they cannot be said to represent what a truly ecumenical group of lecturers would say upon the general theme or upon the particular themes discussed. This is not to impugn the views set forth, but it is to say that the views as set forth do not represent American church thought in cross section. This same weakness appeared in those who spoke for American church life at Oxford.

Having indicated some of the book's limitations, it should be emphatically stated that within its views, it is probably the best single volume published in the United States for the student who desires to be introduced to the underlying problems involved. There is clearness in outline, fairness in statement and abundance of accurate information on every hand. The lecture upon "Church, State and Community in Education," by Doctor Coffin, and the one on "Points of Tension Between Church and State in America Today," by Doctor Cavert, are particularly valuable. That we are not wholly free from the danger of the State's infringing upon the Church and free-

dom of religious belief here in America is rightly pointed out. That the increasing secularization of our educational program is not due to a secular philosophy but to the divided churches being unable to agree upon a program of Christian education which the State might carry out was originally true, but is now only partly true. The secular educational philosophy of Rousseau, represented in America by Dewey and others, is now a most potent factor in barring all religion, yes, in injecting irreligion and anti-religion into our public schools. Very much more might be said about the churches themselves not being unqualifiedly equipped to put on a really worthwhile system of education were they empowered to do so—judging by the quality of work done in many theological seminaries.

A panel discussion and a well-selected bibliography add to the value of the book. Though Oxford is past, this treatise will have real value.

GAIUS JACKSON SLOSSER.
Western Theological Seminary.

The Psychology of Religious Living.

KARL R. STOLZ. Nashville: Cokesbury Press. \$2.50.

A GOOD book is not made, but grows. This is especially true of a book on religious living. Religion has been described as the insight that life is sacred and is one, and that all men may be united purposively in this experience of sanctity and unity. The writer of a book on religious living must have insight into the purposive patterns which unite and sanctify life.

A writer on religious living must view religion from the inside. It is the only way he can see religion at all. If he is a mere observer from the outside he misses the main point. He may catch glimpses

of the pattern that is in process of weaving. He does not sense the presence of the tensions and forces by which the pattern is formed.

The present book is the result of a long process of growth. It emerged out of the strains and problems of people who tried to share in the purposive experience of living religiously. Accordingly the author is not merely concerned with the structure of the religious life, but with the vital process. He does not merely describe patterns, but opens up insights.

It is refreshing to have a psychologist state frankly that he is taking a theological standpoint and to inform the reader what the point of view is. After all, the religious man is greatly concerned with reality. The author believes that God takes the initiative in the religious life of man. God is purposive. God is personal.

This broad theological basis enables the author to employ the insights of various philosophical and psychological trends of our time. This eclectic mood is sound because no trend is complete. Each reflects a partial light upon the religious life. The author makes use of the values of structural psychology, behaviorism and the configuration psychology as well as the insights of Freud and Jung.

The book is divided into two parts. Part one consists of orientation, the background and method. It deals with such topics as the nature of religion, origins of religion, the evolution of the idea of God, humanism and mysticism. The chapters discussing the development of the psychology of religion are especially helpful. The author was a pupil of Starbuck and is thoroughly familiar with the various phases of psychological development since the pioneer work of his teacher.

The second part deals with the living of religion. This centers about the vari-

ous tensions which affect personality and suggests ways in which these tensions may be overcome and an integrated personality may be achieved. The chapters on recentering personality, methods of personality control, the function of prayer in a universe of law, the function of public worship, abound in rich insights and practical suggestions. The final chapter treats religious maturity in a very helpful way. A good bibliography completes the work.

The book is timely and practical. It will help those who are trying to find the insight into the unity and sacredness of life, and are trying to relate themselves purposively in this experience of sanctity and unity.

LEWIS HODOUS.

The Hartford Theological Seminary.

The Validity of Religious Experience. By ALBERT C. KNUDSON. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$2.00.

THIS volume, which consists of the 1937 Fondren Lectures delivered by Dean Knudson at the Southern Methodist University, makes a distinct contribution to the psychology and philosophy of religion. The author lifts into prominence and discusses the central problem of religious experience, which is its validity. With the precision, balance, and lucidity which his large circle of readers have come to expect of him Dean Knudson grapples with the psychological nature of experience, the objective reference of the religious relationship, and the sources of the religious consciousness and expression.

By experience he does not mean any one aspect of our mental life, but something which embraces the totality of the mind. It is grounded in the native creativity of personality. He shows that experience is no more truly the source of belief than

belief is the source of experience, and that the two interpenetrate. What makes experience religious? It is its object, its ontological reference, rather than its psychological components that invests the religious life with a unique quality. Religious experience arises in accordance with active inherent principles of the mind, which includes the innate capacity to think the Infinite. Nothing is to be gained by reducing religious experience to an exclusively divine source, since the mind is structurally dynamic.

Dean Knudson offers a critique of such professed criteria of religious truth as immediacy and value, which are frequently appealed to as decisive in popular religious discussions. Absolute union with God in terms of an unmediated experience of Him excludes the relative independence of man without which no human experience is possible. The identification of value and truth, or of utility and validity, is rejected. In the final analysis, value is a consciousness compounded of feeling and desire, the assumption being that there is no value apart from an existence.

Having disposed of absolute immediacy and the pragmatic conception of value as criteria of truth, the author discusses and upholds the self-verification of religious experience. Regardless of its psychological content, religion is structural in human nature. It is wrought into the very texture of personality. The constructive activity of the mind is the ground of the self-verification of religious experience. There is no "pure" experience, for all experience is mediated or interpreted experience. Dean Knudson makes Kant's underlying philosophical tenets the basic structure of his own thesis.

Dean Knudson has mastered the divergent points of view of such thinkers as Barth, Dewey, James, Schleiermacher, Troeltsch, and Otto. With the skill and assurance of a mature mind he guides his

reader through the maze of variant speculations and leads him into a clear understanding of his own seasoned conclusions. In a style which is direct, simple and comparatively free from obscure technical terminology, he expounds and supports the cogent principle of self-verification. No student of religion can afford to ignore Dean Knudson's volume.

KARL R. STOLZ.

The Hartford Theological Seminary.

The Negro Genius. By BENJAMIN BRAWLEY. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company. \$2.50.

THE author, who has the Chair of English at Howard University, is a writer of accomplishment, having previously to his credit, *Short History of the American Negro*, *Paul Laurence Dunbar*, *History of the English Hymn*, and several other books. He always writes with intelligence, sensitiveness and dignity. Here and there may be found a sentence which suggests a particular racial background, as for example, "She remained for six weeks, having with her two children whose mother she had become." Generally speaking, however, Professor Brawley has attained the aspiration of Countee Cullen, that his work be judged on its merit with no racial consideration to bolster it.

Genius is described as the highest impress of the Divine image on clay. The writer holds that the temperament of the American Negro is primarily lyrical, imaginative, subjective, and his genius has most frequently sought expression in one of the arts. Because of this subjectivity, Negro authors and composers have been better in poetry or in music than in the novel and the drama. The picturesque, as in the opera, Faust, makes the readiest appeal to the Negro. The untutored Negro is thrilled not so much by the moral

as by the artistic elements of religion. The Negro's talent may derive from the mixed element in the race but it is upon the black element that he must rely for his genius.

The first book brought out by an American Negro was by Phillis Wheatley in 1774. General Washington spoke of her as favored by the muses, to whom nature has been liberal and beneficent in her dispensations. Pushkin and Dumas are names which adorn the discussions of the book. Frederick Douglass may still be regarded as the foremost American Negro, a master of invective, of fearless denunciation of wrong, and majestic presence. Josiah Henson, the original of Uncle Tom, was a Canadian Methodist preacher. In the success of Paul Laurence Dunbar, the fondest dreams of the Negro came true. In firmness of organization, vividness of illustration and ability to tell a story, Booker T. Washington evoked comparison with Abraham Lincoln. Roland Hayes excels in causing his hearers to experience just what he feels.

Who would chide Professor Brawley if some of his appraisals appear exaggerated? He asserts that the protest literature of the Negro is his highest contribution to the literature of the nation. It is true that out of gross injustice have come such lyrics as:

Make me a grave where'er you will,
In lowly plain or a lofty hill.
Make it among earth's humblest graves
But not in a land where men are slaves.

Recent protest writing has less artistry and convincingness. And the designation of a certain writer as one of the foremost of sociologists will not be widely accepted.

In the preparation of his *History of the Negro Race in America*, George W. Williams is said to have consulted twelve

thousand volumes and thousands of pamphlets. Professor Brawley seems to have consulted all the sources, laboriously, doubtless, for many of them must be obscure.

The sixteen illustrations are good and the bibliography and the index are notable. This is the best work of its kind.

JOHN W. LANGDALE.

Book Editor of the Methodist
Episcopal Church.

Personality in Philosophical Theology. By ERNEST G. BRAHAM.
London: The Epworth Press. 10s.
6d.

THIS volume, by an English theologian whose interests are philosophical, should intrigue all gentlemen of the cloth who find themselves entangled with debt-raising, roof-repairing, mimeographing, saint-coddling, and with compulsory attendance at service clubs. It is not as profound as Tennant's two volumes on *Philosophical Theology*, but it is deliberately calculated to give one a vacation out of our century, and to ventilate the mind with more ozone than the average church building affords the body.

The author makes the chronology of the thought world revolve about Descartes, so that Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Saint Augustine, Saint Thomas Aquinas are regarded as historical antecedents, while Locke, Hume, Malebranche, Spinoza, Leibnitz and Kant are treated as sequences. At times one is made to feel that the adjective "philosophical" runs away with the noun, but the thesis is clear, and the aim is explicitly stated as an historical and critical account of the concept of the self from Descartes to Kant.

Such an ambitious undertaking calls for appreciation in itself, and the results

of Doctor Braham's work are also praiseworthy. We are made to realize that no system is wrought in a vacuum, and the philosopher seeking a neutral world

"Like God, holding no form or creed
But contemplating all"

is as much of an abstraction as the world he is seeking to interpret. However devoutly we might wish to the contrary, the fact remains that any appraisal of a philosophy must reckon with the make-up of the philosopher, and with his "habitual assumptions." Kant was unconsciously conditioned, for instance, both by the Newtonian theory of physics and by the evangelical Pietism against which he was in revolt. Just because no concept can include both being and manifestation, and because the self as interpreter can never be put among its own objects as one of them, all our little systems accept more mystery at the beginning than they solve at the end.

The conclusions of this book seem to be that personality is bound up in a single bundle of life with the interpretation of reality as a whole. It is our highest interpretative concept, because it is from the knowledge of self that we secure our categories of identity, substance, causal activity, et cetera. We do not find the personalism of Borden P. Bowne and Edgar S. Brightman, which identifies selfhood with consciousness, neither is it allowed that God is realizing Himself in the time process as taught by Hegel and by many neo-realists and neo-idealists today (p. 319). But, in the words of Berdyaev, "Transcendental man is the presupposition of philosophy."

If all philosophers are either Platonists or Aristotelians, then the writer of this work would probably be classified as the latter. He is concerned with the ultimate reality of personal relations, and with body and soul as constituting per-

sonality. In the apostolic succession of Aquinas rather than of Augustine, Doctor Braham inclines to a form of monism rather than to dualism, and he concludes that the best argument for personal immortality is that it makes the ethical life more reasonable. Of course, the writer himself will not be exempt from his own contention. A defense of Theism, of Reality as centered in Divine Personality, and of personal immortality will help chiefly to fortify those already predisposed, and this is why the book was written (p. 9).

WILLIAM P. LEMON.

First Presbyterian Church, at the University of Michigan.

A History of Christian Worship. By OSCAR HARDMAN. Nashville: The Cokesbury Press. \$2.00.

Minister's Service Book: For Pulpit and Parish Use. Compiled and edited by JAMES DALTON MORRISON. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. \$1.50.

Meditations: Suggested by Biblical and Other Poetry. By LAURA H. WILD. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.00.

THE growing interest in Christian worship finds threefold expression in these volumes, one of them a running history of the development of forms of worship in the Christian Church, one of them a manual of materials for the use of ministers, and one a compilation of devotional literature for all sorts of worshippers.

Professor Hardman, who occupies the chair in Pastoral and Liturgical Theology in the University of London, has contributed to the London Theological Library a much needed volume, bringing into brief compass the story of the changing forms of Christian worship as

those changes are related to events in the history of the Church. At a time when, as at Oxford and Edinburgh, the Christian churches are having new experiences in common worship, and are realizing that beneath all the variety of form there is a deep spiritual unity, it is timely to have a book which helps us to understand where our forms of worship originated, how they developed, and how much we all owe to the common fund of liturgical material treasured by the undivided Church before the schism of 1054.

Professor Hardman defines worship broadly. "When a sense of supernatural Presence, however vague in its intellectual definition, finds expression in acts of reverent approach and of dutiful obedience, then there is worship." He pleads for purely objective worship, claiming that while worship is "the path to men's perfection" it is self-defeating when that is its purpose. "If worship is misconceived as a means to morality or resorted to chiefly as a means of edification, not only is there a diminution of its worship-value, but in becoming subjective it tends to lose something of its power of transforming life and to promote the development of the critical faculty in respect of the quality of the devotional exercises employed." (Perhaps that quotation will reveal both Professor Hardman's high doctrine of worship as an act "dominated by the thought and apprehension of the Divine Presence," and also his somewhat pedestrian manner of dealing with so exalted a theme.)

Doctor Morrison, of the Central Baptist Church, Providence, out of his pastoral experience and wide study has brought together into a manual a rich collection of materials for the use of ministers in the conduct of public worship. His book contains suggestions for the Order of Service, collections of Scripture sentences for the opening of the

service, prayers for various parts of the Sunday service and for all manner of special services, and forms for the many ordinances in which the minister is called upon to participate. Much of the best of the classic liturgical material reappears, as it should, in this volume. Perhaps the distinction of this collection, however, is the large number of new prayers by living people (including a prayer by H. G. Wells!), material which is nowhere else available. Doctor Morrison has also rendered a great practical service to ministers by giving much help at those points of the service where variety is so essential and yet so difficult—the Prayer of Invocation, the Offertory Prayer, the Benediction. The section, “On Visiting the Sick,” rarely found in such manuals, is of particular value.

Miss Wild, for so long Professor of Biblical Literature at Mount Holyoke College, has compiled a unique anthology. Beginning with an essay on “Spiritual Symbolism,” in which she asserts that “our experiences of beauty anywhere are pointers to something spiritual,” she has arranged five meditations, each containing poetic passages from the Bible and selections from the poets of the English tongue. Each meditation centers around some aspect of Nature as a symbol of certain attributes of God. “The Mountains and Rocks,” “Water,” “The Air,” “The Heavens,” and “Light” are to her reverent mind suggestions of “something holy, something beyond,” gateways “into the wholly beautiful, the completely sacred.” This is an uplifting little volume, both for personal use, and for use in young people’s groups at out-of-door services, and wherever there are people who travel the ancient highway “Through Nature to God.”

MORGAN P. NOYES.

Central Presbyterian Church,
Montclair, New Jersey.

Old Historic Churches of America.

By EDWARD F. RINES. New York:
The Macmillan Company. \$6.00.

THIS is a beautifully illustrated and justifiably pretentious volume. The author and the National Society of Colonial Dames, under whose auspices the volume is published, may both be proud of a distinctive contribution to American history. For this book is a treasure house of folklore, preserving for posterity many traditions concerning church organization and building which otherwise might have been lost. Moreover, the author shows that our early meeting-houses played an important part in our history and in shaping American destiny.

Colonization began with erecting places of worship, and in these buildings historic political conventions and legislative sessions were often held and schools started. It was at a Virginia political convention held in old Saint John’s Church, Richmond, Virginia, March 20, 1776, that Patrick Henry cried out, “Give me liberty or give me death!” And it was in old First Church at Bennington, Vermont, that the first legislative session was held and that on January 10, 1791, the Constitution of the United States was ratified, making Vermont the first state to follow the original thirteen. The first public meeting in New York to agitate the abolition of slavery was held in the Friends’ Meeting House in Flushing, Long Island. The author has unearthed the records of these early church organizations and building enterprises: Cavalier, Puritan, Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Greek Orthodox.

The number of facts, spicy incidents, romances and historic embellishments brought together in this book is amazing. How many readers recall that Vermont was an independent republic from January 17, 1777, until her admission into the Union, March 4, 1791? Who can

name the Marblehead church whose bell was cracked in ringing the news of independence, the Virginia church in Norfolk that has the chair in which John Hancock sat when he signed the Declaration of Independence, or the church that shows blood stains from the Revolution on one of its pews? Of what church was George Washington the architect, and where is the church that Andrew Jackson built? On the pages of this book are hundreds of such data. There are fifty full-page illustrations. We see Saint Luke's, near Smithfield, Virginia, built of brick in 1632 and the oldest English Gothic church in America. Captain John Smith describes the beginning of English worship in America, going back to the settlement of Jamestown in 1607. But the parish of Saint Augustine, Florida, is by far the oldest in the land. It was organized by the Spanish a quarter of a century before the first English settlement at Jamestown. It has a full set of records, baptisms, marriages, and so on, from the year 1594. There is an excellent picture of the Old Ship Meeting House in Hingham, Massachusetts, erected in 1681, the oldest building in the United States that has been used continuously for public worship, of the Quaker Meeting House at Easton, the oldest building for public worship now standing in Maryland, of the log cabin Rehoboth Methodist Church near Union, West Virginia, the oldest Protestant church west of the Alleghenies, of the oldest Lutheran church in the United States at Trapp, Pennsylvania, and of the Touro Synagogue, Newport, Rhode Island, the oldest Jewish house of worship in the United States. The first Catholic religious settlement in British North America began in March, 1634, when Father Andrew White landed on Saint Clement's Island in the Potomac River.

One lays down this book with a feeling

that America has a heritage in architecture in spite of the atrocities that followed the administrations of Jackson and Grant. Old First Church at Bennington, Vermont, is a classic illustration of how our early colonial churches were desecrated. Its old box pews were taken out and modern "up to date" open pews substituted. In 1865, during the most deplorable period in American architecture, a whole year was spent in further "modernizing" what had been an architectural jewel. At long last Old First has been taken in hand by the state, restored as completely as possible, and made a national shrine.

There is satisfaction in viewing the full-page illustrations in this book of many architectural gems, such as Christ Church at Alexandria, Virginia; the First Baptist Church at Providence, Rhode Island, which houses the oldest Baptist congregation in America, Roger Williams having been the first pastor; Saint Paul's Chapel, the sole surviving relic of New York City's colonial era; Independent Church, Savannah, Georgia, an essential study in colonial architecture; and King's Chapel, Boston, organized in 1686 and the first edifice of the Church of England in New England. In 1785 King's Chapel was the first church in the United States to become openly Unitarian. The enlarged chapel was built in 1749, and is an extremely lovely colonial example. In its original pulpit once preached Charles Wesley. We also have a heritage in the Mission Churches of California, such as Santa Barbara, one of the most picturesque, and in the Moorish architecture of San Xavier del Bac, near Tucson, Arizona, a church pervaded by an air of almost unbelievable medieval richness.

The author has made a decided contribution to both the Church and to historic America.

FRED WINSLOW ADAMS.

Boston University.

Beyond Humanism. Essays in the New Philosophy of Nature. By CHARLES HARTSHORNE. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company. \$2.50.

DEAN ALBERT C. KNUDSON has reminded us in his careful way that panpsychism goes back to Leibnitz. "Lotze endorsed it in his earlier years, and more recently it has been adopted by Mary W. Calkins, C. A. Strong, C. A. Richardson, H. W. Carr, Edgar Peirce and many others. . . . According to panpsychism material things are simply the 'outside appearances' of underlying psychical entities. All nature has at its center living, active beings. . . . It may be objected to panpsychism that it reduces selfhood to such low terms that one is at a loss from the personalistic standpoint to determine in what its reality consists." The supposition that the material world has its ground in innumerable psychical entities Dean Knudson thinks impresses most minds "not only as inherently improbable, but as more or less fantastic."

These characterizations of panpsychism may well be in the mind of the reader as he peruses the brilliant and fascinating book *Beyond Humanism*, by Professor Charles Hartshorne of the University of Chicago. Doctor Hartshorne believes that the quantum mechanics has made possible a new synthesis in the terms of panpsychism. And he looks to Alfred North Whitehead as a particularly successful pioneer in the field. To put the result in a sentence: "The new view consists of such a conception of God and such a conception of nature that the two coincide." "God is, according to the new theism, simply nature as literally and profoundly lovable, and not merely as pleasant to our senses or interesting for us to think about." Doctor Hartshorne urges that we accept a theistic naturalism,

understanding nature itself to be divine. The world is a world of body-mind. "We shall never understand a God of love unless we conceive him as the all-sensitive mind of the world-body." "The new theism can perfectly well state its thesis as, 'the universe is divine,' that is, is the supremely integrated conscious organism."

As Doctor Hartshorne argues—with genuinely perceptive intelligence—of freedom and consciousness, of love and purpose, he seems very much on the side of the angels. His discussions of the positions of Professor John Dewey, of George Santayana, of Bertrand Russell, of the Marxists and of the contemporary positivists, contain many bits of understanding analysis and penetrating criticism. But only the unwary reader will be misled. If you insist on following Professor Hartshorne to his ultimate position you will find a pseudo-unity which gives no adequate basis for the permanent distinctions upon which thought and life rest. He often seems to suppose that by putting words side by side he brings together the opposites for which these words stand. And at such times he is curiously unaware that his achievement is only verbal. Despite his endeavor to make a place for life, on different levels, he gives no real security for the higher values of mind and conscience. Panpsychism performs a marriage ceremony between two incompatibles. In the long run the lower of the two usually becomes dominant. Logically panpsychism eventuates in a naturalism in which the things of sense swallow the values of thought.

Professor Hartshorne has been particularly unfortunate in his title. By *Humanism* he tells us he means "current forms of nontheistic philosophy" and he puts into one bundle of supposed Humanists men quite out of the historic humanistic tradition. Even Joseph Wood

Krutch saw with a quality of clearness Doctor Hartshorne has not attained, when he wrote: "Humanism, the name we give to the most characteristic philosophy of the Renaissance, during its period of highest development, was not, essentially, either the revival of classical learning or that of materialistic skepticism, with both of which it has been identified; but rather an attempt to realize the implication of the fact that life is led upon two planes—the human and the natural—which intersect but do not coincide. It is the expression of a faith in the power of the human being . . . to generate a world above the world of nature, in which the human, as opposed to the natural life may be led." Doctor Hartshorne gives no evidence of knowledge of the rise of humanistic distinctions in Greece, their expression in Latin Literature, their brilliant exposition in the Renaissance or their relation to later streams of thought. He

never mentions Erasmus the great Humanist. And so the author of *Beyond Humanism* takes his place among those who are emasculating a great word.

Doctor Hartshorne always writes with enthusiasm and energy and force, and often with flashes of clear understanding in which a true insight finds the right word. But his style suffers from lack of humanistic discipline and there are times when it is actually careless.

Panpsychism has its own charm and its own subtle allurements. But it is fairly clear, if one thinks critically, that panpsychism represents a false dawn. Or to put it more adequately, one may say that panpsychism is a half-way house from which one will go down to unethical naturalism or up to a view of the universe which sees God as the creator rather than the soul of the world.

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH.

Drew University.

Bookish Brevities

"Art as the Vehicle for Religious Worship" was read by Theodore M. Greene at a meeting of the American Theological Society, April 2, 1937.

.

"Christian Apologetics Today," by Theodore O. Wedel, is to be a chapter in *Approaches to Religion*, which is to be published by Sheed and Ward.

.

"Whither Chemists?" was given in substance as a lecture to the students of Haverford College. It was printed in the *Journal of Chemical Education* and by permission is reproduced, after revision by the author.

.

Behind "The Cure of Souls," by John Sutherland Bonnell, there is a training in mental hospitals that is quite singular in preparation for the ministry and also a highly successful pastoral practice of the principles which are presented. The article will be a chapter in a forthcoming volume which is to be published by Harper and Brothers.

.

Sinclair Lewis says that the American people would rather turn a wheel than turn a page.

.

When crowded by autograph seekers at the Book Fair, H. G. Wells found relief by signing only for those who could name his last four books.

.

A department store in Philadelphia sold fifteen thousand copies of a dollar edition of the King James Bible in the

past six years. A publication of half a million Bibles in one printing was distributed in a few months through the chain stores.

.

To Professor Odell Shepard has been awarded a prize of \$5,000 by Little, Brown & Company for his life of Bronson Alcott.

.

Cresset is a new magazine, presenting a review of literature, the arts and public affairs, and addressed particularly to the more intelligent group in the Lutheran Church. In its first issue it describes a referendum conducted in Princeton University, in which loyalty (Royce-like) was preferred as the most beautiful word in the English language.

.

Bernard De Voto, in application of his conviction that readers are created by the presence of books and association with people who read them, holds that the Carnegie libraries have performed incomparably the greatest service to our culture ever made by private benefaction. They put books into the hands of millions and good books into the hands of hundreds of thousands, and it might almost be said that they formed the literary taste of this generation.

.

In his admirable book, *Christianity and Sex* (Macmillan), Dr. Richard C. Cabot discusses the way, in our imperfectly regulated mechanisms, we are exposed to explosions of one kind or another and we must know enough to avoid them. His own particular type of explosion, he

states, is a library—"I always find that to go into a library results in disaster. I go in with half an hour to spend and I spend five hours. That is obviously ridiculous, but it is also a serious matter."

.

In *Brisbane, a Candid Biography*, Oliver Carlson portrays a very able journalist who was more interested in what he would be paid than he was in the truth of what he discussed. It was a precept of his that it is impossible to exaggerate the stupidity of the public. Busy, tired, and very uneducated, if you don't hit newspaper readers between the eyes with your first selection, there is no need of writing a second. Brisbane became one of the most widely read writers of his generation.

.

Discerning correspondents plead for books of lucid style. Some writers whose thoughts they desire to understand overload their paragraphs with errant speculation and a jargon that takes on the air of authority. The result is an incomprehensibility which is in danger of becoming a fad and of contributing toward mental confusion rather than its clarification. Can it be that such a style is a shadow of the incoherence of the times and a demonstration of the extent to which even many of the able are muddled in the world of realities? It does not deserve the homage of those who in modesty assume it would all be clear enough were they not so dull.

.

New Year's resolutions call upon us to forge ahead and also to take account of deficiencies. It is easy to feel there is something refined about owning a book

apart from any knowledge of its content. To two of these deficiencies clergymen are particularly susceptible; namely, the attempt to get books without paying for them, and the appropriation of material which is copyrighted as property. These practices are genteel rackets which may approach the disagreeable disease of kleptomania, and yet when questioned or thwarted they often are accompanied by maledictions upon publishers and authors. Which is reminiscent of the fish-wife whom Dean Swift heard scolding an eel, because it would not be still while she was skinning it.

.

Lord Tweedsmuir, who is better known as the author, John Buchan, than as the Governor-General of Canada, urges living in close contact with the greatest in literature, because it shapes character and mind and because it provides a standard of comparison against which present-day literature may be viewed. Defining poetry as the best words in the best order, and the greatest poetry as the only possible words in the only possible order, he declared Shakespeare's sonnets to be the high-water mark of lyrical beauty. In reproach of the vulgarity of the day, he cited the song, "O Mistress mine, where are you roaming?
O, stay and hear! Your true love's coming."

and suggested this Hollywood version:

"Huh, sweetie, where you gettin' to?
Your big boy's here and pettin' you.
And he's the guy that rings the bell.
Say, kid, quit hikin' and sit nice.
For shakin' feet don't cut no ice,
The goopiest mut can tell."